

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

SUPPLEMENTS
TO
NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

President: W. C. VAN UNNIK, Bilthoven (Utr.) Netherlands

P. BRATSIOTIS

K. W. CLARK

H. CLAVIER

J. W. DOEVE

J. DORESSE

C. W. DUGMORE

DOM J. DUPONT O.S.B.

E. STAUFFER

A. GEYSER

W. GROSSOUW

A. F. J. KLIJN

PH. H. MENOUD

BO REICKE

K. H. RENGSTORF

P. SCHUBERT

VOLUME IX



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1968

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

BY

DR. H. VAN DER LOOS

PHOTOMECHANICAL REPRINT



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL
1968

This book was printed with financial support of the Netherlands
Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.)

Copyright 1965 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands.

*All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated
in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without
written permission from the publisher.*

FIRST EDITION 1965

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

To my wife

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART ONE MIRACLES

I A	MIRACLES AS RELIGIOUS PHENOMENA	3
I B	MIRACLES AS A PROBLEM.	6
I C	ASPECTS OF THE STRUGGLE TO DEFINE AND EXPLAIN MIRACLES	9
	(a) The atheistic point of view	9
	(b) The phenomenological point of view.	10
	(c) Rationalistically oriented and methodical explanations.	11
	(d) The viewpoint of faith	34
II	MIRACLES AND SCIENCE.	48
	(a) The ancient period.	51
	(b) The classical period	56
	(c) The modern period	58
III	MIRACLES AND MEDICINE	80
	(a) Tension and conflict between theology and medicine	80
	(b) The belief in supernatural causes of disease	93
	(c) Doctors' opinions on the healings of Jesus	100
	(d) Approval and rejection.	106

PART TWO THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

A. INTRODUCTION

I	TYPE AND STYLE OF THE MIRACLE STORIES IN THE GOSPELS.	117
	(a) Aretalogy	117
	(b) The "typical" features of the miracle stories	120
	1. Nature, seriousness and duration of the diseases	120
	2. The failure of official medicine	121
	3. Ridiculing the miracle-worker	122
	4. The difficulty of healing	122
	5. The encounter between miracle-worker and the patient.	123

	6. The treatment of the sick	124
	7. Proof of the reality of the cure.	125
	8. The word "immediately"	126
	9. Pleas, defence and actions by demons.	127
	10. The reactions of the bystanders	128
	(c) Rabbinical and Hellenistic miracle literature	133
II	MAGICAL AND MIRACULOUS PRACTICES OF THE JEWS IN JESUS' DAY	139
III	THE MIRACLES OF JESUS IN THE OLDEST TESTIMONIES. . .	151
IV	JEWISH OPINIONS ON JESUS' MIRACLES	156

PART THREE

B. JESUS AS MIRACLE-WORKER

I	JESUS' MIRACULOUS POWER	179
	(a) Data on the miraculous power and the miracles in the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John	180
	(b) Jesus' opinion of His miraculous power	186
	(c) Extent of the miraculous power	190
	(d) The period during which miracles were performed . .	192
	(e) The nature of the miracles	194
	(f) Jesus' "knowledge"	198
	(g) The problem of the belief in demons	204
	(h) Healing and the Sabbath	211
	(i) The miraculous power of the disciples	216
	1. The data in Acts and the Epistles	217
	2. Jesus' instructions.	217
	3. Comparison between the miracles of Jesus and those of the disciples.	223
	4. Data from the Apocrypha.	224
	5. Data from old Christian writings	227
	6. The end of the period of miracles	228
II	FUNCTION AND SIGNIFICANCE OF MIRACLES IN JESUS' ACTIVITIES	233
	(a) Jesus' conduct as miracle-worker	233
	1. The Messianic aspect	235
	2. The prophetic aspect	237
	3. The priestly aspect.	239

(b) FUNCTION AND SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS' MIRACLES . . .	240
1. Miracles as proof of identity	241
2. Miracles as a display of mercy	243
3. Miracles as a means of arousing faith	245
4. Miracles as a sign	246
(c) Miracles as a function of the Kingdom of God	251
III RELATIONS INVOLVED IN THE MIRACLES OF JESUS.	255
(a) The relation between disease and sin	255
(b) Forgiveness and healing	260
(c) Miracles and faith	264
(d) Miracles and prayer	270
(e) Miracles and the word	280
(f) Miracles and salvation	286
IV JESUS' ACTIVITIES AS HEALER	293
V JESUS' METHODS OF TREATMENT	305
(a) Jesus did not employ any medicines	305
(b) The use of material means.	306
(c) Touching and the laying on of hands	313
(d) The Word	321
(e) Details: the look; looking up and sighing; taking aside	325
(f) Healing at a distance	328
(g) The duration of healing	333

PART FOUR

C. THE MIRACLES OF JESUS. COMMENTARY

1) The Healing Miracles	339
I THE HEALING OF THE POSSESSED	339
(a) Belief in demons	339
1. Conceptions of the origin and essence of demons	339
2. The effect of demons	347
3. Defence against and expulsion of demons	353
(b) Jesus and the demons	361
(c) Healing of the possessed	371
1. Introduction	371
2. The demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum	378
3. The Gadarene demoniac.	382
4. The "lunatick" boy	397

5. The dumb demoniac	406
6. The blind and dumb demoniac	408
7. Mary Magdalene.	409
8. The daughter of the woman of Canaan	411
II THE HEALING OF THE BLIND	415
(a) Introduction	415
(b) The healing of two blind men at Capernaum	417
(c) The healing of the blind man of Bethsaida	419
(d) The healing of the blind man or men at Jericho	422
(e) The healing of the man born blind	425
III THE HEALING OF THE PARALYTICS	435
(a) Introduction	435
(b) The man with the withered hand	436
(c) The paralytic at Capernaum	440
(d) The paralytic at Jerusalem (Bethesda)	450
IV THE HEALING OF THE LEPERS.	464
(a) Medical description of leprosy	465
(b) Description of leprosy in the Old Testament	468
(c) Treatment of leprosy in former times and among primitive peoples	476
(d) The healing of a leper	479
(e) The healing of the ten lepers	494
V THE HEALING OF A MAN WITH DROPSY	504
VI THE HEALING OF THE WOMAN WITH THE ISSUE OF BLOOD	509
VII THE HEALING OF THE WOMAN BOWED TOGETHER.	520
VIII THE HEALING OF THE DEAF MAN WITH A SPEECH DEFECT	523
IX THE HEALING OF THE CENTURION'S SERVANT AT CAPER- NAUM AND OF THE NOBLEMAN'S SON	530
(a) The question of the doublet	530
(b) Exegetic comments	533
(c) The disease and the method of treatment	543
(d) The nobleman's faith	547
(e) Summary and conclusions	549
X THE HEALING OF PETER'S MOTHER-IN-LAW	551
XI THE HEALING OF MALCHUS' EAR.	556

XII	THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD	559
	(a) Jewish, Christian and pagan accounts of the resur- rection of the dead	559
	(b) Jairus' daughter	567
	(c) The young man at Nain	573
	(d) The resurrection of Lazarus	576
2)	The Nature Miracles	590
XIII	THE MIRACLE AT THE WEDDING AT CANA	590
	(a) Exegetic comments	591
	(b) Analogous stories	601
	(c) Explanations	605
	(d) Possibilities and conclusions	612
XIV	THE MIRACULOUS FEEDING	619
	(a) The problem of the doublet	619
	(b) Questions regarding place and time	620
	(c) Details in the accounts	621
	(d) Old Testament and rabbinical accounts of feedings.	624
	(e) Analogous stories among other peoples	625
	(f) Different explanations	627
	(g) Conclusions.	631
XV	THE STILLING OF THE STORM	638
	Introduction	638
	(a) Various explanations	639
	(b) Accounts of the subduing of water and wind	641
	(c) Comparison with Old Testament data	644
	(d) Jesus as master of the forces of nature	646
XVI	JESUS' WALKING ON THE WATER	650
	Introduction	650
	(a) Analogous stories	655
	(b) Old Testament data	658
	(c) Various explanations	658
	(d) The Peter episode	661
	(e) Conclusions.	664
XVII	THE MIRACULOUS CATCHES OF FISH.	670
	(a) Luke's account.	670
	(b) John's account.	674

XVIII	THE ACCOUNT OF THE STATER	680
XIX	THE CURSING OF THE FIG TREE	688
	(a) The intention	691
	(b) The fact	692
	(c) The symbolic meaning	696
	CONCLUSION: History, Miracles and Faith	699
	Bibliography	707
	Text index	727
	Index of authors' names	740

PREFACE

It is often the sad fate of prefaces to be skimmed over or not to be read at all, since the reader is eager to peruse the book proper. And yet it is not the author's intention simply to furnish his work with a customary embellishment. For often the statements and information which the Preface contains are important with reference to the whole of the work presented.

With the late Dr. A.M. Brouwer (d. 1948), professor at the University of Utrecht, I discussed the plan to devote a study to the "miracles of Jesus." He welcomed this intention and encouraged me to make the work as thorough and broad as possible. As the study progressed and the list of literature to be consulted grew steadily, I did, however, often ask myself whether this plan would ever come to fruition. It soon became evident to me that interest in miracles as a phenomenon in the religious life of mankind of all times and throughout the world, and likewise interest in the miracles of the Bible, especially those performed by Jesus, is much greater than is often supposed.

As far as possible I examined studies and explanations of miracles by scholars active in various fields of science. For philosophers and historians, doctors, psychologists and parapsychologists, scientists of many kinds, are confronted with the wonderful (*mirabile*) and the miracle (*miraculum*), upon which they have to pronounce in some manner or the other.

As for the theological side, I considered it desirable to adopt the broadest possible religious and ecclesiastical basis. The literature consulted is principally book literature, since unfortunately I lacked the time and opportunity to make an adequate study of periodicals.

Anyone attempting to plan a work in this way knows before he starts that he will be able to do some of his work only "in part." The specialist, irrespective of his specialty, will always be able to object that some aspect or the other has not been adequately read up, dealt with or thought out. The superspecialization increasing all around us, in which a man's whole life is devoted to a part of a part, is almost enough to discourage a comprehensive study, despite the fact that the latter may be significant and valuable. On occasion only a few steps could be taken in some field or the other; on other occasions the terrain was quite thoroughly reconnoitred.

The following comments may be made regarding the form of the work. Having learnt from the precepts and instructions of others, I have thought it best to keep the text in one language throughout. A one-language text greatly enhances the readability of a book. This arrangement meant a considerable expansion of the notes. Moreover, a personal predilection for quotations rather than circumscriptions has led to a good deal of prominence being given to the notes. In the notes the quotations appear in the original languages, with the exception of the Dutch ones, which have been translated into English. The Greek and Latin quotations are in almost all cases accompanied by a translation. I have done this partly on the advice of others. The addition of a translation is desirable both from the point of view of reaching the widest possible readership and also in deference to the "impatience" of many a reader. In many cases I have taken over or consulted existing translations, of which I would specifically mention the series "Oud-Christelijke Geschriften in Nederlandse Vertaling" (Early Christian Writings in Dutch Translation), published at the beginning of this century under the editorship of Dr. H. U. Meyboom, despite the criticism sometimes heard of this series. On many occasions I have used a translation of my own. The bibliography therefore lists various translations along with the original sources.

The quotations from the rabbis are in the main taken from Epstein's English translation of the Talmud; frequent reference is also made to Strack-Billerbeck's great work.

To ensure uniformity of transcription, Epstein's transliteration of Hebrew has been followed.

For the Greek text I have used Nestle's *Novum Testamentum Graece*, for the Hebrew text the Kittel edition, and for the English text the Authorized Version. For ready reference I have listed in the bibliography, without further classification, practically all the literature consulted.

In discussing the miracles of Jesus I have not kept strictly to the same plan, not only to avoid a certain monotony, but also because the subject-matter lends itself to a varied approach.

A study is written and published in collaboration with a number of "sources," which I should like to mention by name.

I am particularly grateful to the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Zuiver-Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek, (Z.W.O.) the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research, The Hague, whose generous assistance made translation and publication of this work possible.

I wish to express my gratitude to the helpfulness of the Dutch library services. My thanks are due to the Haarlem City Library, the Royal Library and the university libraries, but also to the library of the Teyler's Foundation in Haarlem. This library contains a valuable collection of old editions of early Christian literature, which was willingly placed at my disposal.

Without the devotion and the patience of my wife, and without the aid of Mrs. M. Ionker—Börger, of Haarlem, who typed the Dutch manuscript and assisted me in various other matters, I could hardly have completed this work. It would be an omission if I did not express my sincere gratitude to them.

I should like heartily to thank Dr. W. C. van Unnik, professor at the University of Utrecht, and Dr. W. J. Claas, doctor of mathematics and physics at the Technological University of Delft. The former was so kind as to read through the whole of the Dutch manuscript, and the latter the chapter entitled "Miracles and Science." I am very grateful to them for their comments and suggestions. I also wish to convey my warm thanks to Mr. Trevor S. Preston, of Rijswijk, who made the English translation and with whom I worked in a very pleasant fashion.

It gives me great pleasure that I may finally include in my words of thanks my daughter, Mrs. M. van den Brink, for her willingness to assist me with the correction of the proofs.

I sincerely hope that, though the reader will not always agree with the views brought forward and the solutions suggested, this work may assist him in studying miracles and in understanding and explaining the miracles of Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of the living God.

Haarlem, 1964

H. VAN DER LOOS

PART ONE

MIRACLES

I A MIRACLES AS RELIGIOUS PHENOMENA

Many a writer on the subject of miracles is irresistibly drawn to the well-known words from Goethe's *Faust*: "the dearest child of Faith is Miracle." Quite apart from the point that the expression "child of Faith" is open to challenge in itself, it may be queried whether miracles are in fact "the dearest child." Countless are those who regard miracles as a stumbling-block rather than as an attraction. Modern man, scientifically educated and accustomed to technical skills, feels unaccustomed and uncomfortable when brought face to face with the events related in all kinds of miracle stories. For science can "prove" and "repeat;" miracles can only be accepted or rejected. If need be, a kernel of hard fact can be extracted from the story, or a spiritual message may be discerned in it. In that case the miracle can be left as it is, and a certain appreciation can be felt for the message it contains. If, therefore, a miracle may be seen as a "child of Faith," which is in fact dear to many, it can hardly be denied that the child is very difficult to approach.¹

¹ "Der Glaube schwindet, weil das Wunder, des Glaubens liebstes Kind, dahinfällt. An seine Stelle treten 'die Wunder der Technik' . . . Der russische Bauer, der an die Unverweslichkeit der Gebeine der Heiligen geglaubt hat, kniet heute im Mausoleum Lenins", according to H. FRICK (art. "Die Krisis der Religion" in Bultmann et al., *Krisis des Glaubens*, p. 65). SAINTYVES, *Le Discernement du Miracle*: "La plupart des hommes qui ont reçu quelques notions de sciences modernes admettent en conséquence fort difficilement les récits de faits miraculeux" (p. 99). KAFKA, *Naturgesetz, Freiheit u. Wunder*, remarks that science has an advantage, because it can "nachprüfen". But miracles allow of: „keine Zurückführung des Unbekannten auf ein Bekanntes" (p. 49 ff.). HÄBERLIN, *Das Wunderbare*: "Es kommt alles darauf an, ob wir den Sinn für das Wunder haben". Miracles may be a riddle to man which he wants to solve, or they are to him: "Anzeichen des grossen Geheimnisses". "Rätsel ist Unerklärtes, Geheimnis ist Unerklärbares" (p. 5 f.). Miracles are: "Kundgabe des schlechthin Geheimnisvollen" (p. 8). KLAAS, *Der moderne Mensch*: "Die Krisis des modernen Menschen ist zunächst eine Krisis des Weltbildes; sie beruht auf einer Wandlung der Anschauungen über das Weltbild" (p. 4). BRUNNER, *Offenbarung u. Vernunft*, analyses the Biblical and scientific cosmology. "Das Wunder aber ist das Ärgernis für den Menschen von heute." Modern man has "ein wunderloses Weltbild," or thinks that he has (p. 290). See also CLAUSING, *De mens in de knoop*, p. 196 ff. HOOYKAAS, *Natural Law and Divine Miracle*, p. 162 ff. In the "scientist's soul" there dwells a "horror miraculi." "The scientist as such has a passion for 'laws,' for 'regular' events; everything 'irregular' is either laid aside till better times, or it is made 'regular' by establishing higher or more exact laws, or it is considered irrelevant" (p. 163).

Comparative religion reveals that belief in miracles is universal. "In every religion we find miracles resembling those of Judaism, Christianity and Catholicism. They are all acts through faith and for faith, with the sole difference that they relate to varied deities," says SAINTYVES in an interesting study of miracles.¹ In a concise, clear work MENSCHING discusses miracles from the phenomenological point of view. Miracles play a prominent part both in natural or folk religions which developed spontaneously and in those religions which owe their origin to a founder.

In a miracle the impossible happens.² To primitive man heaven and earth are charged with mysterious forces, and everything is equally wonderful. Everything is subject to cosmic and numinous forces, which act in a capricious, incalculable manner. Primitive man, therefore, sees the wonderful in everything, but he does not concern himself with the problem of possible and impossible. He can only marvel at the enigmatic, the inexplicable, which fills him again and again with the deepest terror. "In the primitive milieu in particular the natural is wonderful and the wonderful natural," says MENSCHING.³ After having pointed out that for us miracles form a contrast to the order of nature, which in our eyes is governed by immutable laws, WEINREICH goes on to say: "The Ancients could regard any divine act as a miracle, even if it followed a natural course. Every event could be interpreted as a miracle."⁴

¹ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 295.

² MENSCHING, *Das Wunder im Glauben u. Aberglauben der Völker*, p. 9: "... Wunder ist das Ereigniswerden des Unmöglichen. Der Begriff des Unmöglichen ist dabei eine variable Grösse; denn es kann sich handeln um das von den Frühzeitmenschen für unmöglich Gehaltene, das aber nach heutiger Erkenntnis keineswegs unmöglich ist, oder um das nach heutiger Erkenntnis absolut Unmögliche."

³ MENSCHING, *op. cit.*, p. 81 . . . VAN BAAREN, *Wij Mensen*, combats the view that primitive peoples are absolutely unaware of the concept "impossible" and that "therefore there is fundamentally no such thing as a miracle for these peoples" (p. 236, note 16; cf. p. 22) . . . There is considerable difference of opinion concerning the concept "primitive mentality" introduced by L. Lévy-Bruhl. Many scholars are opposed to his view that primitive mentality is prelogical. They believe that primitive man does in fact have a well-developed sense of reality, that he in no way lacks empirical knowledge and that he knows the difference between the natural and the supernatural. It is not our task to go into this problem. We merely wish to comment that the same observed religious phenomena can be approached and assessed from different points of view. See among others VAN DER LEEUW, *De primitieve mensch en de religie*, especially p. 14 f.; BLEEKER, *Op zoek naar het geheim van de godsdienst*, pp. 85-94.

⁴ WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. VII. Cf. TENNANT, *Miracle and its*

The remarkable phenomenon of magic demonstrates that even in the greyest mists of time man was beginning to rise up in revolt against the apparently unbridled, arbitrary intervention and domination of higher forces in the form of natural disasters, crop failures, disease, etc. The medicine man and the shaman are the persons gifted with a certain "power" who have to persuade, guide, even coerce the supernatural forces for the greater good of mankind (magic miracles). MENSCHING stresses the point that there are no religious miracles without an author, an "Urheber." Miracles "an sich" do not exist. There is always a higher power behind them: a deity, the founder of a religion, a magician, a saint. And consequently miracles are manifested power.¹

The literature of the history of religions offers an unmatched number of miracle stories, some of which remind us immediately of the miracles of the Bible. When discussing the miracles of Jesus, we shall have occasion to point to various parallel stories.

Miracles figure quite largely in the Old Testament; there are, for instance, the miracles of Moses, Elijah, Elisha, etc. In the days of Jesus the whole world was imbued with the belief in miracles. "Ancient man is neither ready nor willing to set aside miracles, or the power of miracles, from all concrete things, and least of all from man in the flesh. The miracle-worker appears before him, reveals himself to him by magic powers, by feats of arms, by powers of oratory, which set him apart from us, as 'divine', as a hero, thanks to his 'mana,' his 'daimon'," says WAGENVOORT.² Philosophers and wizards, prophets and miracle healers, magicians and astrologers, all of these roamed the countries fringing the Mediterranean. They penetrated the interior of Egypt and of India, like Apollonius of Tyana, everywhere supporting their doctrines by many a sign or miracle, and on their travels they met others who, like them, proved to be capable of startling achievements. Even a superficial acquaintance with Hellenistic syncretism, that strange blend of Oriental

Philosophical Presuppositions: "no hard line could be drawn between the natural and the supernatural" (p. 4). TITIUS, *Natur u. Gott*, p. 120 ff., on the development of belief in miracles.

¹ MENSCHING, *op. cit.*, p. 80 . . . "Am Anfang steht fraglos das Wunder als das Staunen über die in der Erscheinungswelt manifestierte numinose Macht." (p. 89) . . . VAN BAAREN, *Wij Mensen*, p. 139, warns against confusing the terms medicine man and shaman. For shamanism see pp. 139-146.

² H. WAGENVOORT in Van der Leeuw et al., "De Godsdiensten der Wereld", II, p. 119.

and Greek religions, demonstrates that belief in miracles flourished. People tried in all kinds of ways to protect themselves against the influence of malign forces. The strangest amulets protected their wearers against demons, and from a wealth of documentary evidence and inscriptions we know how attempts were made to restrain or stave off disaster by means of incantations and protective gestures.¹ At various places, such as Epidaurus, Athens, Pergamum, Ephesus and Cos, stood the temples of the great god Aesculapius; in these temples the sick could be restored to health by incubation, or be shown the way to recovery.

The miracles of Jesus did not, therefore, take place in a world in which His deeds were regarded as new and unprecedented phenomena, but in a world which was, as it were, "miracle-minded"! As SCHNEIDER rightly remarks: "Christianity did not grow in isolation, but in a very complex environment."² It must always be borne in mind that the apostles and followers of Christ, with the proclamation of Jesus' teaching and work, and "with signs following," Mk. 16 : 20, found themselves in a world in which Simon Magus, Apollonius of Tyana, Alexander of Abonouteichos and many other miracle workers, even including Roman emperors, were revealing their powers. In old Christian literature we find many a passage in which "Christian" miracles are weighed against pagan ones, and the old Christian authors never tired of stressing the all-surpassing power and glory of Jesus Christ in His miracles.³

I B MIRACLES AS A PROBLEM

A common belief is that miracles first became problematic and first gave rise to "protest" at the moment when a certain scientific understanding dawned. And yet there is a protest against miracles that goes back much further, namely the protest of great founders of religions themselves.⁴ In China Confucius refused to accept miracles. Buddha was opposed to magic miracles, from which he distinguished the "miracles of the revelation of man's inner self."

¹ For detailed treatments see among others BLAU, PREISKER, REITZENSTEIN, SCHNEIDER, WEINREICH.

² SCHNEIDER, Einführung i. d. Neutest. Zeitgeschichte, p. 1.

³ See SCHLINGENSIEPEN, Die Wunder des N. T.

⁴ MENSCHING, op. cit., p. 13 ff. . . . "Die grossen Religionsstifter empfanden es als Gefährdung des geistigen Charakters der Religion, wenn zeiträumliche Vorgänge zur Grundlage des Glaubens gemacht werden sollten" (p. 87). Cf. VAN DER LEEUW, RGG, V, col. 2037.

For the Buddhist doctrine itself formed the miracle! Mohammed rejected miracles radically; there was only one miracle, the Koran.¹ Whereas the attitude of these great founders of religions towards miracles was thus a negative or contemptuous one, Jesus' attitude was positive. MENSCHING sees in this an essential difference between Buddha and Jesus. From the point of view of comparative religion this is very interesting; we see in Jesus the appreciation of man in his totality, man in need of redemption. Later worshippers and followers of their masters, inspired by varying motives, adorned the lives of these founders of religions with a luxuriant wreath of legends, and ascribed to them the most startling of miracles; mention need only be made of the legends of the birth of Buddha and of Mohammed. And did not the latter, in answer to the prayers of the inhabitants of Mecca for a sign, split the moon in two?

The protest of the founders of religions was not, therefore, a scientific one, but was the fruit of a criticism that sprang from the essence of their religions. According to them, miracles belonged to the lower regions, and so were in conflict with the higher spiritual spheres of their doctrines.

Besides this religious protest we very soon find a scientific protest, a certain scepticism. The extent of the opposition of Cicero (106-43 B. C.) emerges from the following words: "For nothing can happen without cause; nothing happens that cannot happen, and when what was capable of happening has happened, it may not be interpreted as a miracle. Consequently, there are no miracles... We therefore draw this conclusion: what was incapable of happening never happened, and what was capable of happening is not a miracle."² In a

¹ MENSCHING, *op. cit.*, p. 51 ff. J. H. KRAMER in Van der Leeuw et al. "De Godsdiensten der Wereld", II, p. 356 f. HIDDING, *Mens en Godsdienst*, p. 90. VAN BAAREN, *Van maansikkel tot rijzende zon*. Mohammed did not want to do miracles, p. 18. It is not clear to us why, because of this, Mohammed displayed a "likable" modesty, as Van Baaren puts it. Buddha, on the other hand, lent force to his words by means of miracles, p. 87.

² CICERO, *De Divinatione*, II, 28, quoted by MENSCHING, *op. cit.*, p. 88. "Wunder im Sinne des Ereigniswerdens des von der Naturkausalität her Unmöglichen lehnt Cicero also ab." DRACHMANN, *Atheism in Pagan Antiquity*, calls the philosophical attitude adopted by Cicero academic, i.e. sceptical. "Personally Cicero had no religion other than philosophy," even though as an orator and statesman he was "wholly on the side of the established Roman religion" (p. 115) . . . DRACHMANN says that a distinction must be made between the contemporary concept of atheism, in which "every idea of God" is denied, and that of pagan Antiquity, which he defines as "the point of view which denies the existence of the ancient gods" (p. 1). The viewpoint of Cicero and those of like mind was

truly masterly fashion the orator and satirist LUCIANUS of Samosata (ca. 120-180 A. D.) ridicules the bizarre belief of his day in miracles in his "Philopseudes." A certain Tychiades (representing Lucianus himself) asks his friend Philocles why man is a lover of falsehoods, a philopseudes. He means those lies which are praised for their imaginativeness and beauty and which represent manifest untruths as realities. During a visit to the sick-bed of a certain Eucrates he has met a number of philosophers, and also Antigonus, a physician, who was just as superstitious as the others. Tychiades himself calls sorcery "an old wives' tale," but his opponents, one after the other, tell the most ridiculous stories of miracles. Cleodemos informs the company that once, in broad daylight, he saw someone hovering in the air and walking on water, and that while wearing leather shoes! Doctor Antigonus regales those present with the story of his small metal image of Hippocrates, which takes a stroll at night and knocks over pill-boxes. Eucrates states that he has often seen ghosts and grips the company by his account—he saw it with his own eyes!—of how a certain Pancrates was enabled by a secret magic formula to change a dressed-up broomstick or pestle into a walking servant. Tychiades calls these grown men fools and, in conclusion, addresses these words to his friend Philocles: "But let us be of good cheer, my friend; in Truth we possess a great remedy for these things and the right word to all; if we use that, none of these empty, idle lies will throw us into confusion."¹

Besides an obstinate belief in all kinds of sorcery and miracles—the more preposterous they were, the better—we thus encounter at quite an early stage a scientific and philosophical aloofness from miracles, and gradually a grim struggle develops between belief in miracles and science. In this struggle it is not only the miracles described in the literature of the history of religions and folklore that are in dispute, nor are only the miracles of Roman Catholic saints subjected to criticism; the offensive is likewise aimed against Biblical miracles, against the miracles of Jesus. And this battle is still being waged today.

"practically speaking, atheism, and in this sense atheism was widely spread among the higher classes of the Graeco-Roman society about the time of the birth of Christ" (p. 116; cf. p. 146 f.).

¹ GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 71, remarks: "The only important exception to the credulity of second-century writers is the satirist Lucian of Samosata". Cf. BETZ, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament*.

I C ASPECTS OF THE STRUGGLE TO DEFINE AND EXPLAIN MIRACLES

In popular speech the word "miracle" is used most loosely. As soon as an event is ever so slightly out of the ordinary, it is described as miraculous. This can be seen in cases of recovery from dangerous illnesses or in outstanding rescues. However, when more closely examined, what at first sight conveyed the impression of being a miracle can be attributed to normal causes in almost all cases.

The concept "miracle" becomes unbounded when it is applied to everything that arouses wonder. Nature in her infinite variety, with her ever-astonishing phenomena; man with his countless mental and physical abilities and functions; all of these are called "miracles." Yet, however wonderful all creation may be as such, these wonderful aspects have, through the steady course of events in accordance with a fixed order, acquired an appearance and characteristic that is "ordinary," "natural." For civilized people natural phenomena, for instance, even in their most terrifying form, have a normal, an immanent character, whilst primitive man perceives in them the direct result of higher powers, the transcendental.

The distinction between the wonderful, the mirabile, and the miracle, the miraculum, should always be kept clearly in mind. In the case of a miracle we are always concerned with an event that is supranormal, that transcends the empirical course of events and cannot be fitted into the latter in any way at all. For as soon as there is even the slightest question of an immanent explanation, we must cease to think of a miracle, however miraculous an impression the event may make. Let us leave it for the time being at this general indication of the characteristic of a miracle, and conclude presently with a definition of the concept from the theological point of view.

With regard to miracles, a distinction may be made between four points of view: the atheistic, the phenomenological, the rationalistic ally oriented and the standpoint of faith.

(a) *The atheistic point of view.* This can soon be dealt with. The deliberate unbeliever, who states that he can accept only what is "scientifically" certain, relegates miracles to the realm of fantasy. His description of miracles as fables, the product of a childish imagination, priestly trickery, etc., will lack any positive element. According to CONSTANDSE the miracles of Jesus were "a showman's publicity stunt."¹

¹ CONSTANDSE, Grondslagen van het atheïsme, p. 99.

The atheistic viewpoint is clearly expressed in the following words: "The Bible is based on miracles, and science does not recognize miracles; it therefore rejects. . . the miraculous birth of Jesus and Jesus' miracles. . . and accepts them at most as mythological fancies."¹ Everything that occurs as *mirabile* or *miraculum* is to the atheist something not yet explained or explicable, a riddle which, as science progresses, will definitely be solved and inserted into our known laws and formulas. We may therefore describe the attitude of atheism towards miracles as absolutely negative.²

(b) *The phenomenological point of view.* The phenomenologist naturally studies miracles as phenomena. He analyses and explains the data, searching for resemblances between the stories of miracles, and tries in this way to arrive at a certain "objective" elucidation of the phenomenon as such. It will at once be clear that such an approach can never be wholly successful, since the human mind reacts to material under examination quite differently from the instruments of a laboratory.

We find a phenomenological study in for instance MENSCHING (who sees in many of Jesus' miracles the distillation of legends) and in the Roman Catholic modernist E. Nourry, who under the pseudonym PIERRE SAINTYVES published a number of studies on miracles after he had left the priesthood. He begins "Le Discernement du Miracle" by giving the following broad definition of miracles: "I call a miraculous event a rare or even unique event which is regarded by the person who relates it as transcending the forces of observable nature, animate or inanimate, and thus implying the interposition of a supernatural being, diabolic, angelic or divine, and further confirming the religious worth of a person, a doctrine or a revelation." SAINTYVES subjects miracles successively to the judgment of the historian, the scientist, the philosopher and the theologian, and comes to the conclusion that none of the four is able to solve the criteria of

¹ CONSTANDSE, *op. cit.*, p. 218. Cf. MAUTHNER, *Der Atheismus*. KOCH, *Ab-schaffung Gottes?*

² LE DANTEC, *L'Athéisme*, reasons as follows: "Dans notre état de connaissance imparfaite des lois naturelles, la question positive du miracle est difficile à trancher; pour un croyant, la constatation du miracle est aisée; il en voit partout et n'essaie pas de discuter la valeur miraculeuse du phénomène observé. Pour un athée au contraire, il y a toujours une attitude possible, même devant le fait le plus extraordinaire: 'Je ne sais pas tout', doit-il dire; 'ce que vous me montrez ne s'explique peut-être pas par les lois que je connais; mais il y a tant de lois que je ne connais pas!'. On croit donc au miracle par nature, comme on est athée ou croyant par nature" (p. 64).

miracles.¹ In his comprehensive "Essais de Folklore Biblique," which testify to an exceptionally wide reading in the literature of miracles, SAINTYVES tries to explain various of Jesus' miracles, such as the miracle at Cana and the miraculous feedings, as fertility or harvest rites.

(c) *Rationalistically oriented and methodical explanations.* The third interpretation is forthcoming from those who, on the basis of their philosophical insight into the Divine Being, either reject miracles or subject the stories of miracles to a scientific, critical analysis and then retain a certain residue. Typical representatives of this group are Spinoza, the English Deists, the German rationalists and the later philosophers and theologians influenced by them. The radical thinker SPINOZA (1634-1677) endeavoured, under the spell of the new scientific thought of his day, to wrest himself free from the Church's dogmatic concept of God and to replace this by a religion or ethical system of humanity. For SPINOZA God, substance and nature are identical concepts. God as the *natura naturans*, the first cause of all things, acts in accordance with strict laws. The universal laws of nature are eternal dispensations of God, embracing eternal truth and necessity. This system leaves no room for miracles. But SPINOZA is aware that the common man revels in the wonderful, and that he likes to envisage God as acting "against" the forces of nature, so that he not only sees the "proof" of God's existence in a miracle, but at the same time perceives in it an unambiguous refutation of the views of those scholars who hold a different opinion. SPINOZA endeavours in a sharp and shrewd manner to dispose of this popular sentiment. "So as men are wont to call divine that knowledge that exceeds human understanding, [so they are wont] to call divine or God's works those works of which the cause is unknown to the people: for the people believe the power and the providence of God to be most clearly manifested when they see something happen in nature that is out of the ordinary and contrary to the conception that the people have of the usual course of nature; and they believe that there is nothing that proves the existence of God more clearly than that nature, in their opinion, departs from its order. And therefore the people believe that all those who explain or endeavour to understand

¹ See also RAMSAY, *Miracles*. According to RAMSAY the concept of miracles does not fit into scientific terminology. There is a difference of "languages." "It is only to say that if the word 'miracle' has a logical setting it will not be found in the logic of science" (p. 22).

the phenomena and the miracles as natural events eliminate God, or at least the providence of God. For the people believe that God does nothing as long as nature runs its normal course; and that on the other hand the power of nature and natural causes are inactive as long as God acts; therefore they imagine that there are two forces, which in turn interrupt one another, namely the power of God and the power of natural phenomena which, however, are determined or (as most prefer to think nowadays) created by God in a fixed way. . . The people thus call the unusual works of nature miracles or divine acts, in part from devotion, and in part from a desire to oppose the scientists; they do not wish to know the natural causes of things and long keenly to learn about only those things of which they know the least and which they therefore admire the most.”¹

¹ SPINOZA, *Tractatus theologico-politicus*, cap. VI, De Miraculis: “Sicuti scientiam illam, quae captum humanum superat, divinam, sic opus, cuius causa vulgo ignoratur, divinum sive Dei opus vocare consueverunt homines: vulgus enim tum Dei potentiam et providentiam quam clarissime constare putat, cum aliquid in Natura insolitum et contra opinionem, quam ex consuetudine de Natura habet, contingere videt; et ex nulla re clarius existentiam Dei probari posse existimat, quam ex eo, quod Natura, ut putant, suum ordinem non servet. Et propterea illos omnes Deum, aut saltem Dei providentiam, tollere putant, qui res et miracula per causas naturales explicant, aut intelligere student. Existimant scilicet, Deum tamdiu nihil agere, quamdiu Natura solito ordine agit; et contra, potentiam Naturae et causas naturales tamdiu esse otiosas, quamdiu Deus agit; duas itaque potentias numero ab invicem distinctas imaginantur, scilicet potentiam Dei et potentiam rerum naturalium, a Deo tamen certo modo determinatam, vel (ut plerique magis hodierno tempore sentiunt) creatam . . . Vulgus itaque opera Naturae insolita vocat miracula sive Dei opera, et partim ex devotione, partim ex cupiditate adversandi iis, qui scientias naturales colunt, rerum causas naturales nescire cupit, et ea tantum audire gestit, quae maxime ignorat, quaeque propterea maxime admiratur.” . . . 1. Spinoza wishes to demonstrate: (a) that nothing happens against nature, but that it maintains an eternal, fixed and immutable order (nihil contra Naturam contingere, sed ipsam aeternum, fixum, et immutabilem ordinem servare); (b) that we cannot know the essence or the existence of miracles, and therefore we cannot know divine providence, but that all these can be much better understood from the fixed and immutable order of nature (nós ex miraculis nec essentiam nec existentiam, et consequenter nec providentiam Dei posse cognoscere, sed haec omnia longe melius percipi ex fixo et immutabili Naturae ordine); 2. using a number of examples from Scripture Spinoza will go on to show that Scripture itself understands by God’s decrees and expressions of will, and thus by providence itself, nothing else than the natural order itself, which necessarily follows from His eternal laws (ex aliquot Scripturae exemplis ostendam, ipsam Scripturam per Dei decreta et volitiones, et consequenter providentiam, nihil aliud intelligere, quam ipsum Naturae ordinem, qui ex ejus aeternis legibus necessario sequitur); 3. finally Spinoza speaks of the manner of interpreting the miracles of Scripture and of what has principally to be remarked about the miracle stories (Denique de modo miracula Scripturae interpretandi, et de iis, quae praecipue circa miraculorum narrationes notari debeant, agam) . . .

In England, too, a stubborn battle was waged against miracles. Parallel to the "Aufklärung" in Germany, there developed in the England of the eighteenth century a school of thought in which the independence of the human spirit had its heyday, despite all opposition from the Church. No aspect of life was exempt from the scrutiny of critical, logical thought. A furious offensive was launched against traditional interpretation of the Bible. In its efforts to cleanse the concept of God of all kinds of human traits by critical ratiocination, Deism dealt thoroughly with miracles. The Deists Conyers Middleton and Gibbon campaigned against the miracles of Roman Catholic saints. Thomas Browne, Shaftesbury, Toland, Chubb, Thomas Morgan, Bolingbroke, Hobbes and others attacked the miracles of the Bible.¹ Special mention should be made of THOMAS WOOLSTON

For the views held by rationalistic philosophy on the relation between nature and miracles see DIEMER, *Natuur en Wonder*, II, p. 44 ff. Diemer deals successively with Spinoza and Leibnitz, whilst he also discusses Boyle, Kant, Büchner, Häckel and others.

¹ See MAUTHNER, *Der Atheismus* . . . Conyers Middleton (d. 1750) wrote in 1748 his "Inquiry into the miraculous powers etc.," in which he tried to undermine belief in the stories of the miracle-loving Fathers of the Church. Gibbon (d. 1794) wrote sarcastically of the miracles of the saints (Mauthner, I, p. 33 ff.). Browne, a physician (1605-1682), did not consider himself an atheist, but had little liking for the miracles of the Bible (II, p. 399 f.). John Toland (1670-1722) could not entirely detach himself from the Bible; he did not find the miracles of the New Testament as unreasonable as those of the Old Testament (II, p. 417 ff.). Shaftesbury (1671-1713) was very free in his criticism of the Bible. People ought to liberate themselves from miracles (II, p. 488). Thomas Chubb (1679-1747), a shoemaker by occupation, was very antidogmatic in his attitude (II, p. 509) . . . ZSCHARNACK, *RGG*, I, col. 1678, says that in Chubb the mythological or poetical "Deutung" of the only apparently historical puts in a shy appearance, "obwohl er die Wunder Jesu glaubt." . . . Thomas Morgan (d. 1743) showed himself above all to be a vigorous opponent of the miracles of the Old Testament (II, p. 505). Henry St. John Bolingbroke (1678-1751) remarked that, if the miracles related in the Old Testament had happened before the eyes of all, it would be the greatest miracle of all that a religion furnished with such credentials had not been accepted forthwith by the entire world (II, p. 523). Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) declared himself against all belief in miracles (II, p. 537) . . . David Hume (1711-1776), deist or atheist, in any case a sceptic, concerned himself with the problem of miracles. His *Enquiry concerning the Human Understanding*, published in 1748, contains an essay on miracles. His point of view is at once evident from the following sentence: "A miracle is a violation of the laws of nature, and as a firm and unalterable experience has established these laws, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can possibly be imaged" (*Enquiries*, ed. Selby-Bigge, p. 114). For Hume's views see HEADLAM, *The Miracles of the New Testament*, p. 41 ff. According to TENNANT, *Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions*, p. 81, this work by Hume is "the least characteristic of its author." CAIRNS, *The Faith that Rebels*, remarks: "Hume's argument, briefly put, is that the only conceivable

(1670-1733), who was imprisoned from 1729 until his death because of his startling book "Discourses on the Miracles." He viewed miracles as allegories, and derided the historical point of view in a frequently distasteful manner. He claims that the literal interpretation of Jesus' miracles is based on a multitude of "absurdities, improbabilities and incredibilities." Appealing to reason and to the Fathers of the Church, whom he deeply admires as theologians and philosophers, he summarizes his point of view as follows: "Be no longer mistaken, good Sirs. The History of Jesus' Life, as recorded in the Evangelists, is an emblematical Representation of his spiritual Life in the Soul of Man; and his Miracles are Figures of his mysterious Operations. The four Gospels are in no Part a literal Story, but a System of mystical Philosophy or Theology."¹ An even fiercer opponent of miracles was Peter Annet, who declared them to be completely mythical.²

In this way the Bible was cleansed and purified by reason. Those responsible believed that they were doing Christianity a service, since many could still retain a concept of God which might be regarded as justified by reason. All that remained of miracles were myths, types or symbols. What had been started by the Deists in England spread with surprising rapidity on the Continent, particularly in France (Voltaire, Rousseau) and in Germany. The authority of the age-old dogma of the Church and, linked to it, the culture led and dominated by the Church, were radically broken. The standards of the new thought were not the irrational, but the rational, not revelations, but empiricism, and this new thought endeavoured like fresh, unfailing dynamite to explode the whole pattern of the culture of that time. The traditional authority of the Church and its guardianship of every aspect of life were gone for good. Man's gaze was no longer directed principally towards the hereafter, but towards *this* world, *this* earth with its glorious reality and surprising possibilities. A turbulent sense of freedom burst into life, seeking new ways in science and culture, politics and society. The spirit of Europe was charged with the revolutionary ideas and sentiments of independent man. Only reason could really "enlighten" man! And how deep

way in which miracles can be proved is by human testimony" (p. 23) . . . The two best-known English opponents of Deism were Joseph Butler (1692-1752) and William Paley (1743-1805).

¹ WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, p. (65).

² MAUTHNER, *op. cit.*, II, p. 519.

were the marks that Aufklärung and rationalism left in theology, too! At first many remained hesitant, but it was not long before the criticism of the Bible went so far as to deny Jesus as the Son of God, and even to deny that Jesus had ever existed.¹

Although in the first period of rationalism efforts were made to explain the miracles of Jesus as natural events where at all possible, there was still room for the supernatural. Many were reluctant to overturn the traditional dogmas from their pedestals. We see this, for instance, in such theologians as J. J. HESS (1741-1828), F. REINHARD (1753-1812) and J. G. HERDER (1744-1803). HESS admits that miracles give offence. But the supernatural birth and the resurrection of Jesus may be no more open to doubt than the raising of Lazarus from the dead. However, if possible a rational explanation must be sought and, above all, the moral significance of the miracles should be borne in mind. REINHARD tries to assess miracles soberly and critically. What we call a miracle and supernatural must be interpreted relatively. "The modest thinker will in no case dare to find some operation or the other so extraordinary that God could not employ any mediate causes to bring it about, but had to work it Himself." HERDER, who may not be unreservedly regarded as a rationalist, considers miracles acceptable under certain conditions on the strength of the historical testimony of the Gospels. Jesus had to perform miracles to satisfy the desire for miracles prevalent in His day, but when all is said and done the real significance of the miracles lies in symbolism.²

¹ See inter alia VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA, *Die holländische radikale Kritik des N. T.*; SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*; HARTDORFF, *Historie of historisering?*; RICCIOTTI, *Leven van Jezus*, pp. 211-234, *De rationalistische interpretaties van het leven van Jezus*.

² SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, pp. 27-37, explains that developed rationalism was preceded by an undeveloped rationalism, much of which did not get beyond unbiased supernaturalism. In this connection Schweitzer mentions among others Hess, Herder and Reinhard. . . Hess, *Geschichte der drey letzten Lebensjahre Jesu*, II, remarks that those very events which formerly made the greatest contribution to the confirmation of Christianity: "machen es heut zu Tage bey vielen verdächtig" (III f.). As regards the resurrection of Lazarus, see pp. 117-129. HERDER, *Vom Erlöser der Menschen*, p. 237 f., says of the miracles of Jesus: "Dies ist Geschichte, deren Folgen wir geniessen; über welche, als über eine verlebte Reihe von Thatsachen wir uns keine Prüfung anmaassen können, noch dürfen. So wahr diese Wunder sind, so gewiss sind sie für uns nur *erzählte* Wunder. . . Für uns geschahen diese Wunder nicht, sondern für die Zeitgenossen Christi und für ihn selbst; da haben sie ihren Zweck erreicht." In his work "Von Gottes Sohn, der Weltheiland," HERDER says that all the miracles in the Gospel of John appear there: "als symbolische Facta, als typische

One of the best-known rationalists was H. E. G. PAULUS (1761-1851), a professor of theology who came under the influence of Immanuel Kant's philosophy. We shall have to study his range of ideas more thoroughly. Paulus' aim was as follows: "to make the thorough acquaintance of the purely historical Christ and his original Christianity as handed down to us by the apostles, in the way that it was recorded in the contemporary documents, namely as a simple story without either scholastic or idealistic trimmings. What is in itself true then leads via credibility to belief! The further and the more purely general spiritual development spreads among us Germans of both Churches, above all by means of Christianity itself, the more important becomes the question: how do Christ and reason harmonize with one another?"¹ In the person of Jesus a spirit of our human order and species became a man, and was united with God "as human spirits can and must be united with the Divinity"; for that reason Jesus was able to teach us how we as *human beings* can know and accomplish good.² We shall have to examine with exactitude who this human being Jesus was in the eyes of His contemporaries; what He taught and how He acted, not so that we may linger in the world of ideas of those days, but so that we may understand the history of then in and for the present day. The pragmatizing historian—who may not solely be a compiler and reteller—must unravel the circumstances of the time, in order to discover why people believed what they then believed, and what took place. In other words—and in this the decisive criterion is vested for PAULUS—we must constantly make a distinction between the facts as they were and the opinions on

Denksäulen" (p. 268) . . . As regards REINHARD, see SCHWEITZER, op. cit., p. 31 ff.

¹ PAULUS, Exegetisches Handbuch, I, 2, p. III, in the "Selbstrecension" on the first part . . . This new manual replaces Paulus' commentary, see p. VI. It is concerned with both the history of early Christianity and the doctrine. Paulus ventures to hope that the extensive material which is concentrated in his book: "als kaum irgendwo sonst" will be useful for every investigator. "Und interessiren muss es doch wohl jeden Rationalen, auch den Supranaturalisten, selbst zu prüfen, ob die Probe consequent durchgeführt sey, dass nach einer partheilosen, sachkundigen Exegese die Bibel mit der Vernunft weit übereinstimmender sey, als mit dem geheimnisreichen Theil der Dogmatiken. Oder sollen wir denn uns vorerst Räthsel machen, um sie alsdann (wie künstlich! wie unbefriedigend!) erst wieder lösen zu wollen?" (p. VII) . . . As regards KANT's view of miracles, see his "Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen des blossen Vernunft", pp. 116-124. Kant resists the contemporary belief in miracles. Man, in his rational thought and actions, can make no allowance for miracles. As an example Kant posits the practice of judges, physicians and scholars (p. 121).

² PAULUS, op. cit., I, 2, p. V.

what happened. "It is necessary to separate the opinions of the story-tellers or authors, which arose from the circumstances of those days, from the actual facts of the matter, even if those opinions are intermingled with the facts in the tone of a historical narration, as the result of an error easily creeping in."¹ Facts and opinions are closely interwoven in the New Testament, and it is the task of the historian to extract the pure core of the event from the variegated multiplicity of the opinions of the day. In connection with the belief in demons, PAULUS remarks that a distinction ought really to be made between what happened as a fact and the complex of opinions on the causes. "The opinions have also been handed down to us in the Bible in their correct and original form, and also believed in that form by those who handed them down; but this does not mean that they have to be accepted by the possibly correcter understanding of later times. Only now that we are aware that we ourselves produce dreams, sudden inspirations, fabrications, and so on, is a more precise knowledge of nature and the mind possible."² All the miracles of Jesus must be stripped of the cloak of opinion in which His contemporaries wrapped them; then we shall see that only natural facts formed the basis. The narrators were not capable of distinguishing the mediate or intervening causes, for they were under the spell of the supernatural; however, reasoning man sees in the miracles of Jesus only deeds inspired by the love of mankind, performed by a virtuous man, or the consequence of chance circumstances.

Given PAULUS' views and his method of research, it may well be imagined what results he arrives at. The healings are due to the exercising of a beneficial effect on the nervous system of the sick persons; the deaths referred to in the Gospels were only suspended animation; the miraculous feedings were effected on the principle that a good example has many imitators, and so on.

A rationalistic influence is also perceptible in the explanation of miracles given by F. SCHLEIERMACHER (1768-1834).³ He concludes from data in the Gospels that the miracles must have occupied a considerable part of Jesus' life. It is not certain whether Jesus performed miracles before His baptism; in any case His mother believed at an early stage in His power to do miracles. SCHLEIERMACHER regards the miracles of Jesus as human actions, which find their

¹ Op cit., I, 2, p. 547.

² Op cit., I, 2, p. 484. Cf. p. 544 ff.

³ SCHLEIERMACHER, *Das Leben Jesu*, pp. 203-244.

point of departure in moral motives.¹ "Most of them are humane; Jesus always refused to perform purely epideictic or ostentatious miracles." We can best comprehend His miracles as long as we remain on human ground: "for then there is no lack of analogies of how purely organic diseased conditions can be cured by mental action."² Judgment becomes more difficult in the case of reports such as those relating to the miraculous feedings and the coin in the mouth of the fish, since these lack moral motives.³ Christ was able to deliver people from their sufferings by virtue of His moral purity, that is to say His great spiritual powers and His dominating will acted on a depressed will, something which our experience allows us to understand. SCHLEIERMACHER prefers to leave the problem of the existence of demons out of consideration and to concentrate on the mental condition of the victims. "But," he goes on to say, "it has never been my intention that this should be interpreted as meaning that it should be set aside from the true dignity and nature of Christ, or that it can be reduced to the ordinary realm of nature."⁴ Thus SCHLEIERMACHER regards Jesus' miracles as human actions, but nevertheless proceeding from the peculiar dignity of Christ. They resemble human actions, but are not identical with human actions! Consequently, he too is unable to find a satisfactory solution for those miracles which lie beyond all analogy. It may therefore be said that SCHLEIERMACHER, in his on many points subtle analysis, uses a rationalistic technique, but without becoming bogged down in a

¹ SCHLEIERMACHER, op. cit., p. 219: "Je mehr die Tat als eine sittliche Handlung Christi begriffen werden kann, und je mehr wir eine Analogie aufstellen können zwischen der Wirkungsart Christi und andrer menschlicher Wirkungsart, um desto mehr können wir die Handlungen als wirkliche Bestandteile des Lebens Jesu auffassen; je weniger wir sie aber als sittliche Handlungen Christi begreifen können, und je weniger wir zu gleicher Zeit solche Analogien auffinden können, um desto weniger können wir auch im Stande sein, die Erzählung auf irgend eine bestimmte Vorstellung zurückzuführen und das Faktische davon aufzustellen."

² Op. cit., p. 207.

³ Schleiermacher repeatedly points out that the miracles which are most easily comprehensible are those with a moral motive: "und die als eine Wirkung des Menschen auf Menschen zu denken sind, und ich will nur noch um damit etwaiges Missverständnis zu beseitigen, sagen: ich will damit keineswegs es als eine Aufgabe stellen, dass man diese Handlungen Christi der Wirkungsweise nach soll auf eine bestimmte Weise erklären, sondern nur, dass wir nicht nötig haben, ein übernatürliches, was zugleich widernatürlich wäre, anzunehmen, sondern nur das potentielle Übergewicht, welches in der eigentümlichen Natur und Beschaffenheit Christi mitgegeben ist" (p. 222 f.).

⁴ Op. cit., p. 227.

coarse and extreme rationalism, whilst he also leaves open the possibility of a better understanding of the miracle stories.¹

Although we may regard rationalism as a tidal wave of spiritual life in the Europe of the eighteenth century, which was followed in its turn by other waves such as that of idealism in philosophy and that of a revived orthodoxy and pietism in religion, the force of enlightened thought continued to have unmistakable after-effects. And not only in French positivism and in materialism, which was gradually winning ground, but also in theology, in which these after-effects are still felt today. For independent, critical thought will never cease to search for new ways to oppose the authority and tradition of the Church.

In D.F. Strauss (1808-1874) we encounter the sagacious scholar who endeavoured to adapt the Hegelian structure of thought to the Gospels. In the opinion of STRAUSS supernaturalism was antiquated, whilst the "natural" explanation of Eichhorn and Paulus was anything but satisfactory. A new path had to be followed, and STRAUSS believed that he had found that path in the mythical explanation. Even before him a mythical explanation had been sought for various points, but STRAUSS endeavours to consider the entire subject-matter from the mythical point of view.² "This in no way means that the entire story of Jesus must be explained as mythical, but that it must be critically regarded in its entirety to see whether it displays any mythical traits."³ Knowing that his mind is liberated by his philosophy from religious and dogmatic prejudices — STRAUSS says that this is due to his philosophical studies and as a result considers himself privileged over the most astute theologians of his day⁴ — STRAUSS adheres consistently to his pattern of thought. He declares that the

¹ Op. cit., p. 236: "Daher, wenn mit der Zeit eine Auskunft über die Genesis dieser Erzählungen sich fände, so dass das Wunderbare verschwände, so wäre das keine Störung des Glaubens, sondern ein Gewinn für die rein menschliche Auffassung Christi; aber das können wir nur als Aufgabe hinstellen, die nur erst dann zu lösen ist wenn wir eine vollkommen sichere Theorie haben über die Entstehung der drei ersten Evangelien; aber es ist nicht notwendig dass sie gelöst werde" . . . Schleiermacher bases his "life of Jesus" on the data of the Gospel by John. SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 63 ff., calls Schleiermacher a great dialectician, but: "ein unhistorischer Kopf". "Freilich hat auch keiner so geschickt zu verschleiern gewusst, was er zuletzt von Wundern festhält und was nicht." This criticism is not entirely correct.

² STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, I, p. 29 ff.

³ Op. cit., I, p. X.

⁴ Op. cit., I, p. XI.

inner core of his Christian faith is completely independent of his critical research. "Christ's supernatural birth, his miracles, his resurrection and ascension, these remain eternal truths, however greatly their reality as historical facts is to be doubted."¹ What STRAUSS understands by a myth is an ideal concept, a "Vorstellung" (Hegel), which is reproduced in the form of a historical event. He precisely defines the criteria required for the concept "myth." An account is not historical when it proves: (a) that it is irreconcilable with the known and moreover universally applicable laws of events (causality, succession, psychological laws); (b) that the account contains internal contradictions or one account is in conflict with another (these contradictions may relate to form and material). Nor is an account historical if it can be positively recognized as a myth, partly from the form, and partly from the content. Speeches in poetic form cannot therefore be regarded as historical. The stories of the births of John the Baptist and Jesus display clearly mythical traits. But the most difficult problem in the field of criticism lies in the question: where is the boundary between myth and history? In the case of a miraculous healing by Jesus, for instance, what remains "after subtraction of the miraculous element" may be true as a natural event. "This may, with some restrictions, be conceivable in the case of a number of miracle stories, especially in the casting out of devils." This is because it is not psychologically inconceivable. As regards the man born blind, on the other hand, this is impossible. Consequently STRAUSS measures the accounts in the Gospels with the following canon: "If the particular nature of an event not only is suspect in the eyes of criticism and its external "ornamentation" exaggerated, etc., but also its inner core and foundation are either inconceivable or display a striking resemblance to the Messianic conceptions of the Jews of that time, not only the given "facts" of the matter but the whole event as such must be regarded as unhistorical. If, on the other hand, only a single element of the form of a narrated occurrence has the criteria of the mythical against it, i.e. not the general content, the possibility still remains at any event of presuming a historical nucleus, although it is never possible to ascertain whether one is really present and what it consists of, unless it can be found by other combinations."²

¹ Op. cit., I, p. XII.

² Op. cit., I, p. 110 f. Cf. par. 15 of the "Einleitung," in which Strauss deals in clever fashion with the criteria of the existence of myths.

This lengthy quotation has been reproduced because in this "canon" STRAUSS gives a precise account of his method of research and because it emerges from his careful analysis of the stories of miracles that he uses this yardstick inexorably. When he can find an example in the Old Testament of a miracle wrought by Jesus, he relegates it relentlessly to the realm of myths: the Christians wished to adorn their Messiah with greater powers than the prophets and miracle-workers of the Old Testament possessed! Without sharing STRAUSS' opinion, one may admire the way in which this stubborn thinker, who was certainly not a man whose only joy was destructive criticism, examined every piece in the carefully constructed jigsaw puzzles of the rationalist Paulus and mercilessly demonstrated which pieces had been incorrectly inserted.¹

The opposition to STRAUSS' mythical explanation came from both the orthodox and the rationalistic side. Of the orthodox "Lives of Jesus" which flowed in a steady stream from the printing presses, that by A. NEANDER (1789-1850) made a stir. NEANDER takes the offensive against Strauss—in the preface to his book he characterizes the difference between STRAUSS and others of similar views and himself as a struggle between Christian theism and the principle of the world-and self-idolization—whilst he argues forcibly that Christianity is founded on supernatural facts, and indeed that not one of these may be omitted without harming the whole.² We must interpret miracles as moments in the totality of divine revelation, the fruits of divine love and wisdom; as a part of the totality of revelation their purpose is to restore communion between God and the world estranged from Him. NEANDER does not see any conflict between what happens in miracles and our ordinary experience of nature. It is true that a miracle transcends the laws of nature, but nevertheless it is "natural that they [miracles] bring about such effects which cannot be the result of natural causes; and as nature has been so created by divine wisdom that it has room within its bounds for these higher creative forces (the Schoolmen of the thirteenth century rightly made a distinction between the *potentia activa* and *passiva* of nature when discussing the relation of the supernatural to the natural), there is thus no contradiction here. In the divine scheme of things, of which we see only one side in the occurrence of causal events in the world

¹ See the detailed exposé of Strauss' life and work and the criticism of his opponents in SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 69 ff.

² NEANDER, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 788.

of phenomena, miracles and happenings in accordance with the ordinary laws of nature are mutually and harmoniously related to each other.”¹ Miracles and natural events therefore belong together in the one high ideal causality which is founded in the divine scheme of things. And as the Son of God, Jesus had the power “to act on the innermost forces of nature,” on both human and material nature. In Christ we see, according to NEANDER, the greatest miracle, the centre of all miracles, in whose presence the supernatural is incorporated in the natural process of development.

Quite another theory is that advanced by C.F. VON AMMON (1766-1850), whose aim is rationalistically to examine in the footsteps of Kantian philosophy the life of Jesus “insofar as it forms part of history, as a normal series of earthly phenomena.”² He wishes to show that in reality miracles are only based on natural events. The only miracles are those which are historically conceivable. “An absolute or direct intervention by God in the course of nature indirectly regulated by Him contradicts itself and must therefore be rejected as being in conflict with rational thought.”³ We must abandon the old ideas, for instance those on possession by devils, now that the deeper interpretation of Holy Writ, philosophy, science and even the rational doctrine of One God have made such progress that the opinions formerly held now find only weak and diffident defenders.⁴ We want to elevate ourselves to the ideal of moral freedom and enlightenment, in which we do not feel the idea of evil as a positive element, but as a negation, as “the last blackness of night which retreats before the dawn of reason into the dark, disordered realm of fantasy, and so disappears like a dream when the splendour of God and of Christ rises above our heads.”⁵ VON AMMON pays frank homage to reason when he says: “Only where science and faith join hands does the way of light and truth open.”⁶ In great detail, and with frequent recourse to the Syriac translation of the Bible, which he considers of great importance, VON AMMON deals with miracles and tries here and there, in a surprisingly ingenious manner, to fit them into the bounds of natural events and rational thought. But this does not detract from the fact that, for all one’s

¹ NEANDER, *op. cit.*, p. 213 . . . See the detailed exposé of miracles, pp. 206-251.

² VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu, Vorrede*, Vol. II.

³ VON AMMON, *op. cit.*, III, p. 130.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, I, p. 385.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, I, p. 388.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, I, p. 417.

interest in this careful piece of detection, followed by the arrest of miracles, one gains the impression that a miracle captured in this way by reason hankers after liberation, as a convict in his cell longs for release from his unnatural mode of life!

Throughout the theological work of the French philosopher, theologian and *littérateur* ERNEST RENAN (1823-1892) runs a clear thread of rationalism. To speculation on religion and metaphysics he opposes science, the naked, intellectual judgment of the sober historian. In the preface to the thirteenth edition of his celebrated and hotly contested "*Vie de Jésus*" he says: "Only science is pure, for science has no artifices; it does not play on the heartstrings and it does not make propaganda. Its task is to prove and not to persuade or convert."¹ "We reject the supernatural for the same reason which causes us to reject the existence of centaurs and hippogriffs: for the simple reason that nobody has ever seen them. We do not believe in miracles, just as we do not believe in ghosts, in the devil, in witchcraft, in astrology."² In his study on the apostles he says: "All so-called wonderful acts which can be studied at close quarters can be traced to illusion or imposture."³ Only faith creates the supernatural; if miracles are realities, why do they not manifest themselves in the full light of publicity? "A miracle wrought at Paris before the eyes of competent scholars would put a stop to so much doubt! But unfortunately this never happens. Never has a miracle occurred in the presence of the public to be converted, I mean in the presence of unbelievers. A miracle requires the credulity of the witness. Not a single miracle has occurred before the eyes of those who could have discussed and criticized it."⁴

RENAN does not wish to deny the reality of the supernatural as such. "That God is in every thing, above all in every living being, and permanently too, that is precisely our theory; we only say that no special intervention by a supernatural force has ever been established."⁵ RENAN stresses that he banishes miracles from history not on the authority of some philosophy, but solely on the strength of constant experience. "We do not say 'miracles are impossible'; we say 'up to now there has been no established miracle'."⁶ When

¹ RENAN, *Vie de Jésus*, p. XXVIII.

² RENAN, *Vie de Jésus*, pp. VI, IX.

³ RENAN, *Les Apôtres*, p. XLIII.

⁴ RENAN, *Les Apôtres*, p. XLIV.

⁵ RENAN, *Les Apôtres*, p. XLVII.

⁶ RENAN, *Vie de Jésus*, p. XCVI . . . HOFFMANN presents a good survey in *Les vies de Jésus*, Ch. II, *La vie de Jésus d'Ernest Renan*, pp. 28-51.

Jesus does miracles, that is, in RENAN's opinion, only because He wanted to satisfy the desires of His contemporaries: Jesus was a thaumaturge "malgré lui."

The opposition to miracles continued unabated. Again and again we meet the view once put forward by Strauss that the healings of Jesus were based on mental influence, on suggestion and hypnosis. Now various doctors began to concern themselves with the person of Jesus and His miracles. The French doctor P.A. Desjardin published under the pseudonym PAUL DE RÉGLA a study of Jesus of Nazareth in which he ascribes all miracles to suggestion and hypnosis. DE RÉGLA recognizes the *mirabile*—do we not see it every moment of our existence?—but he emphatically rejects "miracles," which would manifest themselves as a whim of God. He sees wonders as "a negation of the mysterious but immutable laws of universal and individual life," and miracles as "endeavouring to deify nothingness."¹ The miracle at Cana was founded on suggestion: the guests drank "water like wine." Lazarus was brought back to life from a state of lethargy.² Jesus performed His startling deeds as the great adept, the therapist "in whom the whole knowledge of the magicians was concentrated," and He recognized the power of belief in others.³ The results of the "psychiatric" research which a number of doctors felt themselves called upon to perform into the person and works of Jesus may be stigmatized as poor finds. DR. DE LOOSTEN (Georg Lomer) imputes to Jesus a number of pathological traits: melancholia, persecution mania, gradual development towards a fixed system of delusions, etc.⁴ He found in SCHÄFER a capable opponent whose medical skill was, however, greater than his theological knowledge. SCHÄFER is of the opinion that Jesus was a clever hypnotist. He did not perform miracles, for the simple reason that nobody can! Jesus was a "miracle healer," just as we encounter nowadays. "Jesus was a fascinating, suggestive therapist, in the best of faith.

¹ DE RÉGLA, *Jésus de Nazareth*, p. 123 f. "Non, nous ne croyons pas au miracle! Et, nous n'y croyons pas, parce que notre raison se refuse absolument à admettre ce qui n'existe pas, c'est à dire, que, rien puisse faire quelque chose; comme nous ne pouvons pas admettre que le néant, le néant, cette conception de la folie, mot troublant et épouvantable, puisse produire la vie" (p. 127).

² DE RÉGLA, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

³ DE RÉGLA, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

⁴ DE LOOSTEN, *Jesus Christus vom Standpunkte des Psychiaters . . .* De Loosten's intention was not to write a new "life of Jesus", but to criticize Jesus "by the unprejudiced approach of the modern psychiatrist" (Vorwort).

Only in one respect did he differ from the miracle healers of all times: he accepted no money.”¹ In a pithy study SCHWEITZER has protested against the foolish attempts to ascribe some form of mental disease or the other to Jesus.²

Quite a different approach to the explanation of miracles is offered us by the school of comparative religion. Since the end of the nineteenth century the whole ancient world has, so to speak, been laid bare. Again and again new discoveries were reported (excavations, inscriptions, papyri, etc.) and many now began to wonder whether the manifold variety of religious notions in the old world ought not to be regarded in one universal connection, embracing the religion of Israel, Judaism and Christianity. Impressed by the material discovered, and enchanted by the limitless prospects, a host of investigators adopted this new method. They did not wish to explain the New Testament as straightforwardly from the Old Testament as many had done before them. Did not the Old Testament include much extraneous mythical material? We may refer for the purposes of our study to the work of such scholars as P. Bousset, C. Clemen, A. Dieterich, P. Fiebig, R. Otto, O. Weinreich, R. Reitzenstein and P. Wendland. In his study “Poimandres,” REITZENSTEIN concludes that belief and superstition cannot be strictly separated from one another in any era. The history of magic is the best indication of how strongly Judaism was influenced by the surrounding heathendom. But it also tells us that, in part through the agency of Judaism, many of these influences permeated the broad strata of the early Christians.³ In his study of belief in miracles by the Greeks and Romans, WEINREICH encountered considerable material which in form and content resembles the stories of miracles in the New Testament.

¹ SCHÄFER, *Jesus in psychiatrischer Beleuchtung*, p. 68.

² SCHWEITZER, *Die psychiatrische Beurteilung Jesu* . . . It is to be hoped that the general pronouncement by DUMAS, *Le Surnaturel et les Dieux*, p. 106 f., has put a stop once and for all to the “psychiatric” examination of Jesus. “L’aliénation mentale n’est pas altruiste. Si on voulait bien me présenter un paranoïaque ou simplement un aliéné vraiment altruiste et chez lequel l’altruisme serait le caractère dominateur de sa psychose, je serais très heureux de faire sa connaissance, mais je doute qu’on m’en présente jamais, car l’égotisme, la tendance à tout ramener à soi sont caractéristiques des délires paranoïaques et même de l’aliénation mentale tout entière.” Mentally ill “Messiahs” suffer from megalomania and self-exaltation; they want to be Jesus, God, Joan of Arc, etc., and not to bring about: “une réforme dans les mœurs et les croyances des hommes” (p. 106).

³ REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, p. 303.

He recalls the hands of the gods, which brought recovery from illness, and all kinds of accounts of wonderful cures, even going so far as the resurrection of the dead.¹ Now, if Jesus Christ, in His activities as teacher and miracle-worker, is from the viewpoint of comparative religion the type of wandering preacher and charismatically gifted saint as He is depicted by OTTO in his "Reich Gottes und Menschensohn," the question immediately arises whether the entirely new and different aspect, the coming of God into the world, is not blurred and misappreciated as a result of this comparison of religious psychology. Would not this levelling-out process lead inevitably to a distortion of the content of the witness in the New Testament? VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA therefore prefers to persist in his radical point of view that Christianity is the offspring of a marriage concluded between Oriental imagination and Western thought. "The Son of God of popular belief, who does miracles and casts out devils; the wise man of popular philosophy, who in human shape reveals divine grace and glory; the sinless high priest of Philo; the god of mystery who, suffering and dying as a human being, conquers the power of Fate—all of these have contributed to the tremendous synthesis known as Christianity, in which it is believed that the true man is the deified man and the true god the God incarnate."²

Efforts were made to pour oil on the troubled waters agitated by the enthusiasm of the school of comparative religion. CLEMEN advises caution: we must not try to explain every similarity as dependence; we must not start rationalizing! CLEMEN does not attempt to turn a blind eye to the remnants of primitive religion which we find in the earliest Christianity. But often they are rudiments, traces of expressions that have lost their original significance. However, "that which forms the real essence of the oldest Christianity is on the contrary practically independent of primitive religion, whose after-effects are evident only in views and customs which more or less belong to its outer shell."³ Christianity is not as dependent on the non-Jewish

¹ WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. 171 f. Empedocles is said to have resurrected a dead person. Cf. HALLIDAY, *The Pagan Background of Early Christianity*, p. 168 ff.

² VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA, *Voorchristelijk Christendom*, p. 173. Cf.: *Verklaring v. h. Ev. naar Matth.*, p. 257. Cf. DREWS, *Die Christusmythe*, p. 198 ff. "Denn auch der Jesus der Synoptiker ist im Grunde gar kein Mensch, sondern ein 'Übermensch', der Gottmensch, der Kultheros und Heilsvermittler der ursprünglichen christlichen Gemeinde" (p. 214).

³ CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 163.

religions and pagan philosophy as one thinks; the kernel should not be confused with the shell.¹ JELKE also warns against drawing far-reaching conclusions from the analogies in the miracle stories. He remarks that the differences are so striking "that it would be difficult to understand how the evangelical account developed from the pagan story."²

Brief mention should be made of the symbolical explanation as given by W. B. SMITH. Here imagination is indeed given free rein! The Gadarene demoniacs represent the pagan peoples, who were possessed by a legion of false gods; the miracle at Cana was nothing more than a symbol of the blending of the Greek and Jewish religions into a new creed; the ten lepers, who stood afar off, represent the ten lost tribes, and so on. Imagination can indeed run riot through the Gospels.³

A few words written by TRAUB in 1907 demonstrate how hard and difficult many found the battle waged around miracles, in which the conflict between faith and science at the beginning of the twentieth century was reflected. "One has become extremely nervous about dealing with the problem of miracles. . . The popular classification into 'believers' and 'unbelievers' relates principally to the attitude towards miracles."⁴ On the one hand the desire was to retain as

¹ CLEMEN, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N. T.*, p. 285.

² JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 119: "Die gewöhnliche religionsgeschichtliche Betrachtung, die unser Problem so löst, dass sie die christlichen und ausserchristlichen Wunder in gleicher Weise als Produkte menschlicher Phantasie, als Ausgeburten subjektiv-religiösen Gefühls hinstellt, würden wir also abweisen." Cf. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v. h. N. T.*, p. 30 ff., in which the views of Otto, Windisch, etc., are rejected. OEPKE in *TWNT III*, p. 213, points to the difference between the pagan healing stories and the accounts of the healings of Jesus, despite the points of similarity. "Im allgemeinen werden die ausserchristlichen Wunder um ihrer selbst willen erzählt. Die evangelischen Wunderberichte haben dagegen durchweg eine ausserhalb des Wunders liegende sachliche, meist seelsorgerliche Pointe . . . Sie stehen in unzertrennlichem Zusammenhange mit der Eigenart und dem einzigartigen Sendungsbewusstsein Jesu." PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 87; in the Hellenistic miracles the interest lies: "stärker am Geschehen als am Täter."

³ SMITH, *Ecce Deus*, p. 120 (Gerasa); p. 125 (Cana); p. 108 (the ten lepers). The ten lost tribes were "leprous" on account of their: "Berührung mit heidnischem Götzendienst"). "Es war alles nur geistliche Blindheit, Taubheit, Lähmung, Aussatz, Tod, was er überwand, und zwar alles auf dem gleichen Wege, indem man den Armen (den Heiden) das Evangelium predigte" (p. 41).

⁴ TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N. T.*, p. 1. SCHLINGENSIEPEN, *Die Wunder des N. T.*, p. IX f. "Noch immer herrscht unter uns dem neutestamentlichen Wunderbericht gegenüber eine tiefgreifende Verlegenheit, von der kaum ein zeitgenössischer Forscher ganz ausgenommen sein dürfte." But this diffidence cannot satisfy. "Es geht nicht an, dass Anthroposophie und Christian Science die Wunder-

much as possible of the Gospels, and efforts were made to preserve their historical character, and on the other hand one did not wish to stifle one's scientific beliefs. Hence many a person, overwhelmed by all kinds of objections, began at a given moment to doubt the miracles of Jesus, either in their entirety, or a certain group of them. Miracles were then attributed to the subject-matter of the Old Testament, or ascribed to Gemeindetheologie or pagan influences. But, for whatever reason, miracles were removed from history! This is the "reduction method" of liberal theology. The accounts related as historical facts pass through the mill of scientific criticism—which naturally bears a highly personal stamp—and are ground fine. The leading figure of liberal theology, A. VON HARNACK, who endeavours to approach the subject-matter of the Bible as a historian, displays a certain aloofness from miracles. He disposes of the difficulties with a few generalities by asserting that miracles cannot happen, but that a wealth of wonderful and inexplicable things occur. In other words, he recognizes the *mirabile*, but not the *miraculum*. We do not believe, says VON HARNACK, that a storm could be stilled by the word of a man, and we shall never believe it again. "But we may not simply dismiss as impossible the account of the lame walking, the blind seeing and the deaf hearing." Here we have the familiar view: VON HARNACK accepts the possibility that Jesus, by His powerful personality, could have healed the sick. He divides the miracle stories into five groups. They are: (a) stories originating from the exaggerated account of an actual event; (b) stories originating from parables or pronouncements of Jesus, owing to the fact that what was meant as the description of an emotional experience was transferred to the world outside us; (c) stories born of the desire to see in Jesus' life the fulfilment of the prophecies of the Old Testament; (d) descriptions of remarkable cures effected by Jesus' personality; (e) a number of stories for which no satisfactory explanation has been found so far. VON HARNACK cautiously analyses the data which someone who wishes to apply the laws of cause and effect strictly and stringently finds difficult to digest. His comment: "The question of the meaning of the miracle stories fades into insignificance compared with all the beauty of the Gospels" clearly proves that this side of Jesus' activities lies outside VON HARNACK's sphere of interests.¹

geschichten der Bibel für sich in Anspruch nehmen, während die kirchliche Theologie über sie schweigt."

¹ VON HARNACK, *Het wezen van het Christendom*, p. 21 ff.

We encounter the same view in O. SCHMIEDEL. Although the actual events have obviously been exaggerated by tradition, it may be assumed that Jesus, by His imposing personality, exercised a beneficial influence on the sick. The nature miracles did not happen; modern research can discover only transformed parables, symbols and allegories.¹ The quantity of material "reduced" varies, depending on whether the theologian's approach is liberal/conservative (the French theologian FILLION reproaches for instance B. Weiss for his half-heartedness because, although Weiss believes in Jesus' miracles, he nevertheless finds a natural explanation for several of them²), semi-radical or radical. Describing "the present status of the problem of Christ," WINDISCH wrote the following in 1925. We have available "a nucleus of reliable tradition, in which in very striking lines a man is drawn for us who heals the sick but who is in no way an omnipotent thaumaturge, but rather a wandering preacher and teacher, who moves among men as an ordinary man, disputes with 'other' rabbis and scribes (although he is their master), whose authority and power are denied by many and accepted by few, and who finally is betrayed by one of his disciples, taken prisoner and sentenced to death as a false prophet and Messianic rabble-rouser."³ WINDISCH distinguishes between two traditions, viz. that relating to the Jewish rabbi Jesus and an equally interesting one concerning Jesus the healer: "who possesses healing powers anchored in the depths of his religious endowments—remember the miracle-working rabbis in Palestine and Eastern Europe or the miraculous deeds of the sheiks among the Mohammedans."⁴

This part of our survey will be concluded by a reference to the psychological explanation of Micklem, the parapsychological one of Van Mourik Broekman and that of the "formgeschichtliche"

¹ O. SCHMIEDEL, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 44. Cf. W. BOUSSET, *Was wissen wir von Jesus?* p. 55 ff. The historian can only assume: "dass da, wo solche Wunder erzählt werden, Legende und nicht Geschichte vorliegt." By critically sifting we find the "historical granite" in the Gospels. We find the same idea in SOLTAU, *Hat Jesus Wunder getan?*, p. 20. A good survey is given by JONES, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*. See also HOFFMANN, *Les Vies de Jésus*, Ch. IV, *Les Vies de Jésus libérales*: Sabatier, Stapfer, Albert Réville, Réglu, pp. 71-88. As regards these scholars' view of miracles, see p. 82 f.

² FILLION, *Les Miracles de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, I, p. 98 f. "M. B. Weiss n'admet pas la divinité de Jésus-Christ dans le sens strict; de là découlent ses autres erreurs." Cf. SMIT, *De Daemoniaciis*, p. 19 f.

³ WINDISCH, *De tegenwoordige stand van het Christusprobleem*, p. 28 f.

⁴ WINDISCH, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

method. MICKLEM proceeds from the idea that Jesus had a remarkably firm grasp of human character and that He gave the impression of being a really sympathetic and authoritative man.¹ MICKLEM is fully alive to the remarkable cures at Boston and Lourdes. Jesus' healing of a large number of sick persons by mass suggestion is completely acceptable from the psychological point of view. But, although we find in modern psychotherapy considerable assistance in understanding the healings of the New Testament, psychotherapy cannot entirely solve the problem of the cures.²

Carefully, and after much cogitation, VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN used parapsychology as a new means of understanding the miracle stories of the Bible, "It is easy to see that the Bible is open to elucidation by parapsychology, since it contains many traditions which correspond to occult phenomena noted nowadays and increasingly understood. The method of analogy will have to assist us here, on the basis of comparison, in determining the probability of the reality in these traditions."³ VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN believes that there are two possible representations of miracles, viz. that of the wonderful, the supernatural, and that of mystery. He says that he himself is more inclined towards consciousness of a mysterious element than confidence in wonders. A mystery must be regarded as a permeation of the natural by the supernatural, whereas in the wonderful the supernatural disrupts the natural.⁴

The "formgeschichtliche" method, or "form criticism," endeavours to approach the miracle stories from an entirely different point of view. This method regards the New Testament as a literary product, and asks what lies *behind* the body of written sources, and what laws

¹ MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*: "I take as postulates, without attempting any detailed proof, that Jesus manifested a remarkable keen insight into human character, and that He gave the impression of a man of real sympathy and authority. These traits, which have an important bearing on the present study, seems to me to stand out unquestionably in the Gospel narratives" (p. 5).

² MICKLEM, *op. cit.*, p. 136. Cf. TAYLOR, *The Person of Christ*, p. 160 f.

³ VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *Parapsychologie en Godsdienslig leven*, p. 58.

⁴ VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 115 ff. Cf. KUHHAUPT, *Die okkulten Erscheinungen u. das Wunderbare um die Person Jesu*. According to Kuhaupt Christianity is built: "auf einer Tatsachenmystik." The miracles reveal its roots in the supernatural. The miracles of Jesus must be rated highly. "Die Wunder Jesu und das Wunderbare in der Welt des Okkulten sind insofern Blätter ein und desselben Buches, als uns in beiden Sphären das mens agit at molem als Wahrheit und Tatsache entgegentritt, im übrigen aber stehen die Wunder Jesu unendlich höher in ihrem Wesen und Ziel als die okkulten Erscheinungen; diese haben einen Heilswert, jene allenfalls einen Erkenntniswert" (p. 40).

and motives dictated their distillation into *this* particular form. There was first, from ca. 30-60 A.D., a period of oral tradition, in which certain fixed patterns gradually developed. Form criticism tries to unravel these patterns so as to discover the original threads. By means of separation and classification in different groups the original forms can, it is believed, be found and their milieu, their "Sitz im Leben," localized.¹ This method is criticized and rebutted by many, but it is difficult to deny that it has certain merits for New Testament theology.² Bultmann, however, has elevated it to a springboard for historical judgments, and SCHICK rightly reproaches him with considering it to be an ultimate truth that it was motives which created the stories.³ BULTMANN believes that Hellenistic miracles can be found everywhere. He does not doubt that Jesus performed deeds which both in His own eyes and in those of His contemporaries

¹ The method of form criticism, applied by H. Gunkel to Genesis, was taken over by M. Dibelius in 1919 for the N. T. See among others M. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*; K. L. SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*; R. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*; M. ALBERTZ, *Die synoptischen Streitgesprächen*. For criticism see among others E. SCHICK, *Formgeschichte u. Synoptikerexegese*; L. KÖHLER, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Neuen Testaments*; MCGINLEY, *Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives*. Cf. H. VANDER LOOS in Waszink et al. "Het oudste Christendom en de antieke cultuur", II, p. 137 ff.

² G. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v. h. N. T.*, p. 9: "‘Form criticism’ renders it plausible that the very genesis of the Gospels was determined entirely by belief in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God." O. CULLMANN, *Christus u. die Zeit*: "Es ist gewiss das grosse Verdienst der Formgeschichtler, Historikern wie Theologen eindrücklich vor Augen geführt zu haben, dass die Evangelien keine Biographien, sondern Glaubenszeugnisse sind" (p. 26). Cf. MICHAELIS, *Einleitung i.d. N. T.* DE ZWAAN, *Inleiding tot het N. T.*, I, p. 9 f., puts forward the following objection to "form criticism": neglect of the Aramaic milieu and too much reliance on Western motives of our time. LINDESKOG, *Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitl. Judentum*, p. 325 f., points out that Jewish quarters seem to have little interest in "form criticism." The Jew has more confidence in the authenticity. "Ihm ist es selbstverständlich, dass die Schüler des grossen Rabbi Jeschua gespannt auf seine Worte achtgaben, sie sich tief einprägten und sie später in der Gemeinde vortrugen und kommentierten." Lindeskog rightly considers this assessment of "form criticism" very important.

³ SCHICK, *Formgeschichte u. Synoptikerexegese*, p. 296 . . . See BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 244: "Je weniger die Wundergeschichten als solche historische Berichte sind, desto mehr ist zu fragen, wie sie in die evangelische Tradition hineingekommen sind. Auch wenn einigen Heilungswundern historische Vorgänge zugrunde liegen, so ist doch ihre Formung die Arbeit der Tradition gewesen. Und wenn auch die Motive teilweise in der Gemeinde spontan gewachsen sind, so sind doch zum teil peripherische wie zentrale Motive auch aus volkstümlicher und vielleicht auch schon literarischer Wundererzählung übernommen worden."

were "miracles," but most of the accounts of miracles in the Gospels are the distillation of legends, or at least have a legendary trimming. The course of their history in tradition was one in which the motives changed, and variants and exaggerations occurred. In a separate study BULTMANN endeavours to clarify his views on miracles. In his opinion the concept "miracle" consists of two elements: a miracle is a deed of God, an "action" of God, and it is a "miraculous event *contra naturam*." The concept of miracle can be developed in each of these two directions. The view of miracles as wonders must be abandoned, since we see the natural event as something governed by certain laws. This "seeing" is not a subjective observation, not a form of "outlook on life" nor the fruits of science, but it simply "becomes part of the world along with our existence." Come to that, even in primitive man's mental world miracles are not unaffected by causality; a miracle here is a divine act in a higher causality. When the Bible speaks of wonders, allowance must be made for the mental world of the authors. They did not consistently plumb the depths of the concept "miracle". There is only one miracle, that of revelation. This revelation is the revelation of the grace of God to the godless, forgiveness. This forgiveness is not an idea, but an event, an action of God. Consequently, when the Jews require a sign (1 Co. 1 : 22), this is an expression of their impiety: they invoke *their* accomplishments before God, and God must likewise reveal Himself to them, in startling deeds. Viewed in this light, a wonder is an object of their wishes. But the Christian, who understands in faith the one miracle of forgiveness, can see new miracles again and again. "This world event, which in the eyes of the unbeliever must appear as a train of events governed by laws, acquires for him the nature of a world in which God acts. And insofar as he himself hears God's demand and acts in obedience, his own actions are no longer worldly works, but the working of a miracle." In BULTMANN's opinion the miracles in the New Testament are of the nature of wonders. Insofar as they relate to acts of Jesus, healings, etc., they are acts which were events for those whom they then concerned. But, even if all these acts should be historically guaranteed, they would not directly concern us as works of a man from the past. "Viewed in this way, they are not works of Christ, insofar as we understand by the work of Christ the work of redemption. Consequently, in the discussion the 'miracles of Jesus,' insofar as they are events from the past, must be radically exposed to criticism, and it must be argued with the greatest severity

that the Christian faith has absolutely no interest in proving the possibility or reality of the miracles of Jesus as events from the past, and that this would on the contrary merely be an error. If Christ stands before us as the Christ preached to us, then the miracles of Christ can only enter into consideration insofar as they form part of the preaching of Christ, that is to say as testimony." The miracles of Jesus prove that precisely miracles are not suitable for confirming faith: "for they leave anyone the choice to convert them into a causality which he understands." However, they also prove that the Christian belief in God is not pantheism or monism. One cannot speak at will of acts of God; one can speak of them only when God reveals Himself in His actions and this is concretely observed.

These, then, were BULTMANN's views.¹ A product of the school of comparative religion, he tries to find a synthesis between historical and systematic theology. However, for that purpose the Biblical cosmology must be "demythologized," that is to say the message of the Bible, and also that of the New Testament, must be stripped of their cloak of myths. In connection with our subject we may mention three of Bultmann's many opponents by name. In a painstaking analysis of the relation between the word and miracles in Jesus, PERELS points out that both the classification proposed by Dibelius for the miracle stories and that of Bultmann are inadequate.² However, this is merely a question of form. PEREL's criticism becomes more serious when he says that Bultmann's view that miracles had a Hellenistic origin is incorrect. "It will, however, depend on whether one assumes that the beginnings of the miracle tradition go back to Jesus Himself. If that assumption is not made, Hellenism is definitely nearer as an origin than Judaism."³ In emotional fashion Alan RICHARDSON engages in polemics with Dibelius and Bultmann. He emphatically argues that the miracle stories of the New Testament may not be regarded as parallels of the Judaic or Hellenistic miracle stories, either in form, or in content, or in their motives.⁴ Boldly

¹ BULTMANN, *Glauben u. Verstehen*, I, art. "Zur Frage des Wunders," pp. 214-228. Cf. the commentary on Bultmann's views in DE JONG, *Kerygma*, p. 270 ff. . . . BULTMANN regards the Gospels as "Kultuslegenden." Mark created this type; Matthew and Luke reinforced the mythical side of the gospel in a number of respects. "Von dem Evangelium als einer literarischen Gattung zu sprechen, ist also kaum möglich; das Evangelium ist eine Grösse der Dogmen- und Kultusgeschichte" (*Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 393 ff., Schluss).

² PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 58.

³ PERELS, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

⁴ RICHARDSON, *The Miracle-stories of the Gospels*, p. 24 ff.

he aims his weapon at the heart of form criticism with his remark: "It may indeed be questioned whether the form of the miracle-stories has any great importance at all."¹ Another no less fierce comment is that of HUNTER, with Bultmann as his target. He reproaches Bultmann with his extreme scepticism with regard to the historical reliability of the Gospels, and summarizes his opinion as follows: "Years ago Loisy complained that Harnack's Jesus was but the reflection of a liberal Protestant face. Bultmann's Jesus might be said to be the reflection of a Barthian face. C'est dialectique, mais ce n'est pas histoire."²

At this point we shall conclude the first stage of our exploration. We have noted the various techniques used and the divergent results at which very different minds have arrived. However, all of them, though in varying degrees, were inspired by rational, critical thought, which endeavoured to subject the miracle stories of the New Testament to a scientific inspection. The opposition felt by K. BARTH to the studies of the Bible from the point of view of historical criticism may be appreciated on that score. He blames the "Leben-Jesu-Forschung" for its failure to appreciate the nature of the revelation, its miraculous nature. In approaches ranging from mildly conservative to hypercritical, efforts are made "to extract from the New Testament, by means of a series of combinations, amplifications and in particular deletions, only the figure of Jesus the man, the 'historical Jesus,' as he might have lived in the years 1-30, perhaps as a visionary near to madness, perhaps also as an exalted religious and moral personality, perhaps also as a Superman equipped with extraordinary, even unique gifts, but yet in essence as a man, as a companion of our own times."³

(d) *The viewpoint of faith.* We have now arrived at the fourth attitude which can be adopted with regard to miracles, i.e. that of "faith." The word faith, however, requires further amplification. First of all we must apply a restriction, that is to say we leave out of consideration belief in miracles in non-Christian religions. Furthermore, we should specify what we mean by "Christian faith," since this is in itself a comprehensive concept. It is inevitable that the author will have to voice his personal views in this respect. Whoever believes that the God of Israel sent in His Son Jesus Christ the Lord and Saviour of the world will, on the grounds of this belief and

¹ RICHARDSON, op. cit., p. 28.

² HUNTER, *Interpreting the New Testament*, p. 54.

³ K. BARTH, K.D., I, 2, p. 71.

profession, understand and interpret the miracles of the New Testament in a certain way. It is the "credo" which, theologically speaking, gives the concept of miracle its final form and content. As such, therefore, miracle may well be called "the child of Faith." Miracles, i.e. the account of Biblical miracles, are simply placed before me, but in the final instance it is my own affair whether I believe this account, and not only in accordance with a spiritual trend, but as a historical fact. RICHARDSON rightly says that the answer to the question concerning the historicity of miracles "is always a personal answer. It is not the judgment of an historian qua scientific investigator, or the verdict of a school of theologians, or the pronouncement of an authoritative council of churchmen. The present writer can do no more than testify to his conviction that in Christ the power of God was indeed revealed: the miracles *did* happen." He adds, however, that detailed research will constantly have to be carried out.¹

Apart from a few differences in stress, we encounter practically the same constants in both the Roman Catholic and the Protestant definition of the concept of miracle. To learn the views of the Roman Catholic doctrine we can best consult THOMAS AQUINAS, who in his "Summa totius Theologiae" subjected miracles to a wide and systematic study. A number of important pronouncements by THOMAS in the form of conclusions follow. The first conclusion relates to miracles as such, in which THOMAS explains the distinction between the "mirabile" and the "miraculum." "I answer that the word miracle has the same roots as admiration. Now admiration occurs when the effects are clear, but the cause obscure, as a man wonders when he sees an eclipse and does not know the cause, as it is stated at the beginning of the *Metaphysica*. It may, however, be that the cause of some effect is known to someone, whereas it is unknown to others. Hence something may be wonderful to one person and not wonderful to others, as the man in the fields wonders at the eclipse of the sun, whilst the astronomer does not. A miracle is, however, that which, so to speak, is wondered at by all, which undoubtedly has a cause entirely obscure to all. This, now, is God. Hence those things which

¹ RICHARDSON, *op. cit.*, p. 127 ff. Compare with this the pronouncement by LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle*, p. 402: "... nous n'hésitons pas à admettre, sur l'autorité de l'Église, vengeresse de la vérité des Livres Saints, que l'ânesse de Balaam parla, que Jésus-Christ marcha sur les eaux, qu'à sa mort le ciel s'obscurcit et que les sépulcres rendirent leurs morts."

God brings about outside causes known to us are called miracles. . . Secondly it may be said that miracles are not called difficult on account of the aspect of the matter in which they occur, but because they transcend the powers of nature. In the same way they are also called unusual, not because they do not happen frequently, but because they happen outside the ordinary, the natural.”¹ In another passage THOMAS clearly repeats what he understands by a miracle. “I answer that something is called a miracle in the true sense when it happens outside the order of nature. . . Thus something is called a miracle that happens outside the order of the whole of created nature. But only God can do this.”² THOMAS argues that one miracle is not greater than another. Only the Power of God is infinite. Nevertheless, differences in degree can be noted among the miracles. “I answer that nothing may be called a miracle in comparison with the Divine Power, since any deed whatsoever, compared with the Divine Power, is most insignificant, according to Isaiah 40. Behold, the nations are as a drop of a bucket, as nothing. But something is called a miracle in comparison with the power of nature that it transcends. And therefore, the more it transcends the power of nature, the more it will be called a miracle. Now something transcends the power of nature in three ways. Firstly, as regards the substance of the event, for instance that two bodies are at the same time, or that the sun returns in its course, or that the human body is glorified; which nature can in no way do. These, now, occupy the highest degree among miracles. In the second place something transcends the power of nature, not as regards what happens, but with respect to that in which it happens,

¹ THOMAS, *Summa Theologiae*, I, X, qu. CV, art. VII: “Respondeo dicendum, quod nomen miraculi ab admiratione sumitur. Admiratio autem consurgit cum effectus sunt manifesti, et causa occulta. Sicut aliquis admiratur cum videt eclipsim solis, et ignorat causam: ut dicitur in principio *Metaph.* Potest autem causa effectus aliquius apparentis alicui esse nota, quae tamen est aliis incognita. Unde aliquid est mirum uni, quod non est mirum aliis. Sicut eclipsim solis miratur rusticus, non autem astrologus. Miraculum autem dicitur quasi admiratione plenum, quod scilicet habet causam simpliciter et omnibus occultam. Haec autem est Deus. Unde illa, quae a Deo fiunt praeter causas nobis notas, miracula dicuntur . . . Ad secundum dicendum, quod arduum dicitur miraculum non propter dignitatem rei in qua fit, sed quia excedit facultatem naturae. Similiter etiam insolitum dicitur non quia frequenter non eveniat: sed quia est praeter naturalem consuetudinem.”

² *Op. cit.*, I, qu. CX, art. IV, “Respondeo dicendum, quod miraculum proprie dicitur cum aliquid fit praeter ordinem naturae . . . Ex hoc ergo aliquid dicitur esse miraculum, quod fit praeter ordinem totius naturae creatae. Hoc autem non potest facere nisi Deus.”

such as the resurrection of the dead and the restoration of sight to the blind, and the like. For nature can cause life, but not in a dead person. And it can give the power of sight, but not to a blind man. And this occupies the second place among miracles. In the third way, something transcends the power of nature as regards the manner and order of doing. As when someone is suddenly healed by Divine Power of a fever without medical attention and the ordinary natural process in such [cases]; and when suddenly the air by Divine Power thickens into rain without natural causes, as happened in answer to the prayers of Samuel and Elijah. And such occupy the last place among miracles. Each of them has, however, its own different gradations, depending on the different ways they transcend nature."¹ The essence of THOMAS' views may thus be summarized as follows: (a) only God can work miracles; (b) the point of comparison for miracles is not Divine Power but the power of nature; (c) there is a difference between the miraculum and the mirabile; (d) miracles are works that happen outside the known laws of created nature; (e) a distinction can be made between three "degrees" in miracles; (f) God cooperates as the highest cause in the mediate causes (*causae secundae*) of normal natural events. If God intervenes directly we have an absolute miracle.²

The principal elements of Thomas' views can already be found in AUGUSTINE. This Father of the Church, who had to fight his theological battles on a wide front, was also obliged to launch an

¹ Op. cit., I, qu. CV, art. VIII: "Respondeo dicendum, quod nihil potest dici miraculum ex comparatione potentiae divinae quia quodcunque factum divinae potentiae comparatum, est minimum: secundum illud Isai. 40. Ecce gentes quasi stilla situlae, et quasi momentum flaterum reputatae sunt. Sed dicitur aliquid miraculum per comparationem ad facultatem naturae, quam excedit. Et ideo secundum quod magis excedit facultatem naturae, secundum hoc maius miraculum dicitur. Excedit autem aliquid facultatem naturae tripliciter. Uno modo quantum ad substantiam facti. Sicut quod duo corpora sint simul, vel quod sol retrocedat, aut quod corpus humanum glorificetur: quod nullo modo natura facere potest. Et ista tenent summum gradum in miraculis. Secundo aliquid excedit facultatem naturae, non quantum ad id quod fit, sed quantum ad id in quo fit. Sicut resuscitatio mortuorum et illuminatio caecorum, et similia. Potest enim natura causare vitam, sed non in mortuo. Et potest praestare visum, sed non caeco. Et haec tenet secundum locum in miraculis. Tertio modo excedit aliquid facultatem naturae quantum ad modum et ordinem faciendi. Sicut cum aliquis subito per virtutem divinam a febre curatur absque curatione, et consueto processu naturae in talibus: et cum statim aër divina virtute in pluvias densatur absque naturalibus causis: sicut factum est ad preces Samuelis et Eliae. Et huiusmodi tenent infimum locum in miraculis. Quaelibet tamen horum habent [diversos gradus, secundum quod diversimodo excedunt facultatem naturae."

² Cf. WENDLAND, RGG, V, col. 2043.

offensive against his philosophical opponents on the matter of miracles. Augustine sees nature not as an independent magnitude standing outside God, but as an area in which God's will is absolutely binding. God's power is not bound, but is completely free. "For how can anything be against nature that happens by the will of God, since the will of so great a Maker is the nature of every made thing? A miracle therefore does not happen against nature, but against nature as it is known. Who, now, shall count the multitude of miracles preserved in the history of peoples?"¹ For AUGUSTINE the laws of nature are thus nothing more than the expression of the will of God;

¹ AUGUSTINE, *De Civitate Dei*, XXI, VIII, 2: "Quomodo est enim contra naturam, quod Dei fit voluntate, cum voluntas tanti utique Conditoris conditae rei cuiusque natura fit? Portentum ergo fit, non contra naturam, sed contra quam est nota natura. Quis autem portentorum numerat multitudinem, quae historia gentium continetur?" Cf. XXI, VIII, 5: "As it was therefore not impossible for God to institute [the natures] that He wished, so it is not impossible for Him to change the natures which He has instituted as He willed. Hence, too, the uncontrolled growth of the multitude of those miracles that are solemnly proclaimed as auguries, miraculous signs, miracles and apparitions: if I were to collect and state these, where would be the end of this work?" (Sicut ergo non fuit impossibile Deo, quas voluit instituere; sic ei non est impossibile, in quidquid voluerit, quas instituit, mutare naturas. Unde illorum quoque miraculorum multitudo silvescit, quae monstra, ostenta, portenta, prodigia nuncupantur: quae recolere et commemorare si velim, huius Operis quis erit finis?) In his work: *Contra Faustum Manichaeum libri triginta tres*, Lib. XXVI, III, Augustine says with regard to Faustus' questions about the death of Jesus and Elijah: "Now men who err like you cannot know what happens in accordance with nature and what happens against nature . . . Now God, the Creator and Maker of all that is natural, does nothing against nature; for what He has made shall be natural for each thing, He who is responsible for every rule, number and order of nature . . . But we say nothing incongruous [if we assert] that God does something against nature, which He does against what we know of nature . . . For this we call nature: the known and ordinary course of nature; when God does something against this [these things] are called great or miraculous deeds" (Quid sit autem secundum naturam, quid contra naturam, homines qui sicut vos errant, nosse non possunt . . . Deus autem creator et conditor omnium naturarum, nihil contra naturam facit: id enim erit cuique rei naturale, quod ille fecerit, a quo est omnis modus, numerus, ordo naturae . . . Sed contra naturam non incongrue dicimus aliquid Deum facere, quod facit contra id quod novimus in natura. Hanc enim etiam appellamus naturam, cognitum nobis cursum solitumque naturae, contra quem Deus cum aliquid facit, magnalia vel mirabilia nominantur) . . . Augustine gives a concise pronouncement on miracles in *De Utilitate credendi*, XVI, 34: "I call a miracle that which seems difficult or unusual beyond the expectations or the capacity of him who wonders at it" (Miraculum voco quidquid arduum aut insolitum supra spem vel facultatem mirantis apparet). — Cf. VAN HOVE, *La Doctrine du Miracle chez Saint Thomas*, p. 26 ff., on the difference between Augustine and Thomas with regard to the concept of miracles; it embraces more in Augustine than in Thomas.

it pleased Him to institute the known normal order of nature, and He can change this order when and where He will.

Roman Catholic doctrine has remained stable in its view of miracles; the descriptions of later date do not differ noticeably from one another. For instance, MICHEL understands by a miracle "a fact produced by a special intervention of God in the world, with a religious intention, outside the normal order in which the activities of the whole of created nature manifest themselves." (Michel points out that "outside" is not the same as "against.")¹ PAUWELS gives the following definition: "A miracle is a fact which can be observed by the natural faculties of man, but which transcends the forces of created nature and can only be performed by God."² The Roman Catholic Church, in one of the "canones" of the Vatican Council of 1870, anathematizes those who reject miracles. "If anyone says that no miracles can happen,—or that miracles never can be known for certain, or that as a result the divine origin of the Christian religion cannot be definitely proved, he shall be excommunicated." During the above Council the following important pronouncement, which gives clear expression to the Roman Catholic view of miracles, was also recorded in one of the capita of the Acta: "So that our obedient belief would harmonize with our reasoning nature, it pleased God to annex to the internal aid of the Holy Ghost external proofs of His revelation, viz. divine happenings and, above all, miracles and prophecies. For such facts are a clear proof of God's omnipotence and infinite knowledge; they are therefore most certain signs of God's revelation, which are moreover well attuned to

¹ See art. "Miracle" in the Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique, X, Paris, 1929.

² PAUWELS, *Het Wonder*, p. 27. Cf. the same author's *Apologetiek*, p. 148 ff. . . . The subdivision into miracles *supra*, *praeter* and *contra naturam*, in which the nature, the manner and the effect of the miraculous event therefore come into play respectively, must be called more scholastic than illuminating. MONDEN, *Het Wonder*, discusses in detail in Part I, *Theologie van het mirakel*, the three essential characteristics of a miracle: its function as a sign, the deed of power and the outward manifestation . . . BERKOUWER, *De Voorzienigheid Gods*, considers the contrast drawn by Roman Catholic theology between "ordinary nature" and "the reality of miracles" characteristically supranaturalistic (p. 242). Here the miracle becomes the "point of intersection" between nature and the supernatural; a kind of "competitive" relation occurs between these two (p. 262). Berkouwer objects to this approach to miracles. In his opinion the issue in Holy Writ is not a "breach" of the natural order; the issue is not the "possibility" but the "reality" of miracles (p. 247). Anyone who considers miracles against the contrast "God—(law of) nature" misses the deepest significance of miracles (p. 259). In our opinion Berkouwer does not state the problem correctly.

powers of understanding of us all.”¹ However, according to MENSCHING the pronouncements of the Vatican in 1870 regarding miracles are obviously inconsistent with the demonstrable findings of the history of religions. For the latter demonstrates among other things that the founders of religions themselves doubted the evidence of the external miracles and that in actual fact faith was assumed in the miraculous event.²

The Reformers, in fact, speak of miracles in simple terms. They regard them as “deeds of God in which His actions are revealed to us in a particularly striking fashion.”³ When CALVIN speaks of the sun as a witness of the providence of God, he refers to the sun miracles related in Joshua 10 and 2 Kings 20. He sees in these “few miraculous works” that sunrise and sunset are not the result of a “blind impulse” of nature, but that God’s Kingdom is revealed in them “to fill our consciousness with the feeling of his fatherly favour and love for us.”⁴

In the older Protestant theologians we repeatedly find it stated

¹ PAUWELS, *op. cit.*, p. 17 f. . . . The Roman Catholic scholar VISSER, *Parapsychologie*, p. 305 ff., has some interesting things to say about the contemporary view of miracles held by the Roman Catholic Church. According to the conviction of the Roman Catholic Church “not everything that superficially presents itself as a miracle in the Bible must also be accepted as a historical wonder . . . The official point of view of the Church, which must be shared by every Catholic, is that: 1. the Bible records genuine miracles, which can only be explained as the result of the direct action of God, and 2. there are other facts recounted in the Bible, which at first sight perhaps seem to be miracles, but which, upon further consideration, have to be given a natural explanation.” Consequently, Visser thinks, it is conceivable that parapsychology may also make “a modest contribution” to the explanation of Biblical data. However, he stresses that the evangelical miracles are of quite a different nature: “they are a breakthrough of the superhuman, of the Divine” (p. 308).

² MENSCHING, *op. cit.*, p. 111.

³ WENDLAND, *RGG*, V, col. 2043. MENSCHING, *op. cit.*, p. 94. Whilst old Protestant theology again took as its starting point Thomas’ concept of miracles, we encounter among the Reformers quite a different concept of miracles, viz. the religious one. So says MENSCHING, who divides miracles into four large groups: mythical miracles, “aktuelle Bestätigungswunder”, magic miracles and religious miracles (p. 77 f.). “Unter religiösem Wunder wollen wir die unter Staunen und Verwunderung geschehende Begegnung mit dem Heiligen verstehen unter grundsätzlichem Verzicht also auf die Norm- oder Gewohnheitswidrigkeit objektiver Phänomene” (p. 78). According to Luther faith is the true miracle, so that we find here: “den rein religiösen Wunderbegriff”. DIEMER, *Natuur en Wonder*, II, p. 42 f., remarks that Luther and Calvin spoke of miracles in the practical theological sense and not from the point of view of theoretical philosophy, as did Augustine and Thomas.

⁴ CALVIN, *Inst.*, I, 16, 2.

that a criterion of miracles is that they are acts of God which transcend the powers of nature. Several of these theologians stress the teleological nature of miracles as testimony to revelation. The purpose of miracles is to confirm the divine truth and to confirm faith. Riissen's definition is as follows: "Miracles are special works of God, outside the order and beyond the forces of creation, to confirm the Divine truth." Hottinger writes: "As miracles are works transcending the forces of the whole of created nature, only God can produce them." We find the same idea in Alstedt: "Miracles transcend the powers of all nature." And Endemann gave the following definition: "A miracle is a supernatural activity, out of the ordinary, which is produced by no-one else but God."¹

We have already dealt in detail with the struggle around miracles in the period of enlightenment and rationalism. As already mentioned, in orthodoxy the views of Thomas recur again and again. Recalling this, HERRMANN says that, although at a given point he departs from the traditional view of miracles, he wishes to retain the old idea of "above and against nature" (*supra et contra naturam*), since in his opinion this is a splendid expression of "what religion means by miracles, viz. that God opens to man another reality than nature does."² The "opening of another reality," to borrow Herrmann's effective phrase, forms part of the task of revelation. In this connection we return once more to the view that miracle is "the child of Faith." From the phenomenological point of view, it may be said with respect to all religions that miracle is the child of Faith. But a child is an offspring, and if we were to describe miracles solely as the offspring of

¹ For the views of Protestant theologians see HEPPE, *Reformierte Dogmatik*, p. 213. "Miraculum est opus Dei singulare, extra ordinem et supra vires creaturarum, ad confirmandam veritatem divinam" (Riissen). "Miracula, cum opera sint totius naturae creatae vim excedentia, solus Deus edere potest" (Hottinger). "Miracula excedunt vim totius naturae" (Alstedt). "Miraculum est effectus supernaturalis, insolitus, a nemine quam Deo producitur" (Endemann). Cf. BAVINCK, *Geref. Dogmatiek*, I, pp. 349-395.

² HERRMANN, *Offenbarung u. Wunder*, p. 42. . . . Cf. RUPPRECHT, *Das Wunder in der Bibel*, p. 44 ff. LUTHARDT, *Kompendium der Dogmatik*, p. 154: "Das Wunder ist ein in dem Zusammenhang des Weltlebens hereintretender Akt unmittelbar göttlicher Wirksamkeit, welcher in der Freiheit Gottes seine Möglichkeit, in der Heilsgeschichte seine Notwendigkeit wie seine Wirklichkeit hat." BRUNNER, *Der Mittler*, p. 381 f.: in Jesus the transcendent Kingdom of God has come; miracles are central to Biblical faith; Jesus' signs must be regarded just as seriously as His words. DOLCH, *Theologie u. Physik*, p. 75. To the theologian miracles are: "gleichsam die 'Knüpfstellen', an denen die beiden innerlich wesentlich verschiedenen Bereiche des Übernatürlichen und des Natürlichen äusserlich verknüpft sind . . ."

faith, we should be failing to recognize the nature of the Christian religion as a religion of revelation. It is not *our faith* that has produced the miracles of the Bible. The miracles were told to us, offered to us as works in which the living God reveals to us His will, power and love. From the viewpoint of Biblical theology, miracles are first and foremost a direct act of God, in which He wishes to manifest Himself at a given moment and in given circumstances in that particular way and not otherwise. In the next chapter we shall return to the question whether this manifestation means an abolition, disruption or suspension of natural laws.

With the assertion (of faith) that miracles, like prophecy and theophany, form part of the activities of Divine revelation, we deliberately dissociate ourselves from rationalism and naturalism.¹ The miracles of Jesus are not the remarkable deeds of a religious or human genius, but in their way they reveal God's salvation among men. This salvation, revealed in a special manner, can by its essence only be understood by a special knowledge, the knowledge of faith. In this latter sense miracle may indeed be called the child of Faith; the acceptance of, the belief in, miracles is the fruit of belief in the God of revelation.

CAIRNS makes a striking remark about miracles as the salvation of God, as an expression of His power and love. "The malady of our time lies in its contracted thoughts of God. We think too narrowly and meanly of His Power, His Love and His Freedom to help man. That is what the "miracles" of Jesus and His teaching about Faith mean. That God is more near, more real and mighty, more full of love, and more ready to help every one of us than any one of us realizes, that is their undying message."²

K. BARTH has said noteworthy things about miracles as revelation. In an argument with the Schoolmen about the omnipotence of God, he rejects the distinction between the ordinary power (*potentia ordinaria*) and the extraordinary power (*potentia extraordinaria*) of God. "A miracle is not the proof of a special, but merely the special proof of the *one* Divine omnipotence."³ A miracle is "an event comprehensible only as an exponent of the special new direct act of God in time and history."⁴ BARTH argues elsewhere that in every-

¹ See BAVINCK, *Geref. Dogmatiek*, I, pp. 360, 367.

² CAIRNS, *The Faith that Rebels*, p. 246 f.

³ K. BARTH, *K.D.*, II, 1, p. 608.

⁴ BARTH, *K.D.*, I, 2, p. 70: "Ein Wunder ist in der Bibel nicht irgendein schwer

thing that happens there is no element of chance, but constancy, no arbitrary aspect, but fidelity. Everything happens within the framework of fixed rules, and God Himself is the law behind all events, but He will have to be "permitted" to disregard inexorably the laws known to us, i.e. our understanding of the ontal laws. "The more precisely the coming of the Son of God is announced in the Old Testament, and the more directly His revelation is affirmed in the New Testament, the more natural it appears to the open-minded reader that this must be a question of events which can only be understood as works *supra et contra naturam*, as Divine shaping and planning, to which our concepts of planning are simply not equal."¹

The above will now be briefly summarized.

The atheist regards miracles as naive fantasy or priestly trickery, which do some useful drudgery as a means of propaganda among the credulous.

Spinoza, the Deists and others of similar opinions reject miracles on the strength of a philosophically developed concept of God.²

The consistent rationalists consider miracles to be at variance with the results of independent thought. The critical theologians, who do not recognize Jesus as the Son of God, but honour Him as a man to a greater or lesser extent, have tried in a hundred and one ways to explain the miracles of Jesus as analogous and immanent, but these explanations all prove, without exception, to be inadequate. However, this description of the results of rationalistically slanted theology does not alter the fact that the detailed study has been illuminating on many a point and possesses a positive value for New Testament science. The methods and experiments referred to above which were used to explain miracles have helped to inspire scholars to concern themselves more intensively with miracles than is often the case. GOGUEL, for instance, relieves himself of the problem of miracles all too easily when, in connection with Jesus'

begreifliches, auch nicht irgendein schlechthin unbegreifliches, sondern ein sehr begreifliches, aber eben nur als Exponent der besonderen neuen, direkten Tat Gottes in der Zeit und Geschichte begreifliches Ereignis . . . Das Wunder gehört also zur Offenbarung."

¹ BARTH, K.D., III, 3, p. 146. Cf. K.D., IV, 2, p. 232 ff., where Barth discusses in detail the miracles of Jesus.

² TENNANT, *Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions*, p. 10, appositely remarks that Spinoza naively identified the association of thoughts with the association of things, and believed "causa to be identical with ratio."

healings, he remarks that the mental disposition of the persons concerned played a decisive part in their cures, and concludes with the words: "The historians must be satisfied with establishing these facts. It is the task of doctors and psychiatrists to give an explanation of them."¹

The "objective" description which Saintyves gives of miracles as religious phenomena contains the elements required for a good definition of the concept.

The nucleus of the theological view of miracles held by Thomas Aquinas, viz. that of miracles as acts of God *supra et contra naturam*, is repeatedly encountered in later theology.

From the viewpoint of Biblical theology the description of miracles as "the child of Faith" is insufficient. A miracle is primarily a form of divine revelation confronting man, which he can believe, doubt or reject.

In conclusion we shall ourselves try to give a definition of miracles, but before so doing we must mark out a number of boundaries. The difference between the *mirabile* and the *miraculum* must always be clearly borne in mind, as must the difference between miracles and wonders.² As regards the latter, MENSCHING has defined the

¹ GOGUEL, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 129.

² SIKKEN's work *Het Wonder* again reveals the absurdities which may be the result of forgetting the distinction between *mirabile* and *miraculum*. "All that exists is a miracle; outside miracles nothing exists" (p. 6), can only hold true as a general pronouncement. For instance, Sikken calls the eye a "miracle." That may be, but when Jesus heals the eyes of the blind, we encounter another concept of miracle. Jesus' walking on the Sea of Galilee evokes the following question for Sikken: "Who will say that skating is less marvellous than Christ's walking on water?" (p. 101). With regard to the miraculous feeding he asks: "Why do frogs exist? Why is the feeding in Mark 6 more incomprehensible than the existence of a frog?" (p. 102). . . . Different, but no less confusing, is the chapter which the neurologist VAN DEN BERG devotes to miracles (*Het Wonder*) in his book *Metabetica*. To the believer miracles are "the habitual state of affairs" (p. 216); belief in wonders is belief in a "corrupt nature" (p. 214). Under the heading "De geloofwaardigheid van het wonder" (The Credibility of Miracles) Van den Berg perpetrates a fascinating psychological interpretation of the account of Jesus' walking on the Sea of Galilee. The author argues that the disciples were in a dangerous storm, but that the coast was the coast of the land where their exceptional master sojourned. "In their difficulties they were with him. That was their faith; they were with him. In this faith the miracle then happens. So greatly were they with him—so great was their faith in him—that Christ in fact came to them. This should not be taken to have a supernatural meaning. Everyone knows what is meant. If I am with you in this way, dear reader, you come to me . . . At the moment when Christ came to them and they perceived his form more and more clearly, they went to him with renewed hope. Peter even left the boat."

difference as follows: when the subjective relation to the Divine power, the Numinous—as this exists in miracles—is removed, wonders remain as the subject of superstition.¹

The subdivision into absolute and relative miracles must be considered problematic. JELKE rightly comments that this subdivision could only have as a criterion what we experience as possible nowadays.² RUPPRECHT also makes a distinction between miracles with the aid of “forces already present” (for instance the passage of the Red Sea, the destruction of Jericho, Peter’s catch of fish, the coin in the fish’s mouth, many healings, etc.) and miracles which required “higher forces” (such as the miracle of the manna, the miracle at Cana, the feedings, Jesus’ walking on the water, the resurrection of the dead, etc.). However, it is not clear why he does so, since he says immediately afterwards that the boundary between these two kinds of miracles is in general a “fluid” one. He says that “in many cases it must remain an open question whether God employed immanent or transcendent forces here.”³ But why then is this laborious classification of miracles necessary?

The view that God cooperates as highest Cause in the contributory mediate causes (*causae mediae*), which in themselves form part of the bedrock of the normal order of nature, opens the way to all kinds of speculations. How far these speculations can go emerges from NEUBERG’s assertion. He sees mediate causes almost everywhere, and goes on to say: “All miracles must be arranged causally in one way or the other; not one is conceivable without molecular events and none of them happens without the *causa media* of the word. Even the sovereign creative power of God is never represented without the intermediate cause of the commanding word.” God

Van den Berg takes as his basis the account in Matthew. Anyone who takes the trouble to reread Mt. 14 : 22-33 will see that the interpretation does not tally. The disciples believed that they were seeing a “spirit” and “cried out for fear.” This is quite different to “renewed hope!” Moreover, note Peter’s words: “Lord, if it be thou . . .”

¹ MENSCHING, *op. cit.*, p. 89: “Mit der Verselbständigung der Welt und der Erfassung einer gewissen Regelmässigkeit im Naturverlauf löst sich das Wunder vom Subjekt und erscheint als objektives normwidriges Sonderereignis. Auch dieses normwidrige Wunderereignis ist solange religiöses Wunder als es erlebnismässig mit der Gottheit oder göttlicher Macht in Beziehung gebracht wird. Wird aber die subjektive Beziehung zum Numinosen gelöst, dann bleibt das Mirakel übrig, das Gegenstand des Aberglaubens ist.”

² JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 15 ff.

³ RUPPRECHT, *op. cit.*, p. 44 ff.

spake! "It would therefore be wrong if piety felt it should condemn mediate causes and were to expect a direct intervention by God without these causes."¹ We object to NEUBERG's view that the word, the speaking of God, is a mediate cause. When the Bible writes and men speak of "the speaking of God," this is an anthropomorphic designation giving expression to the self-revelation, the self-manifestation of God, but this speaking may not be set apart as a *causa media* from God!

We must also query the distinction between religious miracles and metaphysical miracles. Although the only issue here is the manner in which miracles are regarded, the subdivision as such does not take us any further.

KAFKA draws attention to a subdivision which in his opinion has not been brought forward hitherto, viz. that of "geschehende" and "gewirkte" miracles. He cites as an example of a worked or performed miracle the healing of the leper, Lk. 5 : 12 ff. In Jesus' words: "I will, be thou clean" there rings a command, an order; the miracle is worked, performed. The situation is different with the woman with the issue of blood, Lk. 8 : 43 ff. Without Jesus having done anything about it, a force went forth from Him; the miracle "happened." Such "miracles that happen" occur in particular at places of pilgrimage, says KAFKA; there the sudden cures "happen."² This distinction certainly testifies to keen powers of observation, but it is of little use in clarifying the miracles of the New Testament as such.

Having drawn the above boundaries, we believe that to define the concept "miracle" in the sense of Biblical theology the following guiding principles should be observed.

- (a) Miracles are a form of divine revelation.
- (b) This form of revelation can be observed as a phenomenon by anyone (inimical Jews often witnessed Jesus' miracles) but can only be understood in its true nature and significance by faith.
- (c) We can only speak of a miracle when an event occurs outside and against the known order of nature. This event must not be open to any natural explanation whatsoever, and it must also never be capable of explanation in any natural way whatsoever.
- (d) God performs no miracles without meaning. A miracle may manifest itself in rescue or punishment, salvation or disaster: every

¹ NEUBERG, *Das naturwissenschaftliche Weltbild der Gegenwart*, p. 278 f.

² KAFKA, *Naturgesetz, Freiheit u. Wunder*, p. 102 ff.

miracle that happens has a meaning, not only for the person concerned but also for the whole of mankind.

(e) In miracles God manifests His freedom, power and love. As Creator and Sustainer it has pleased Him to introduce order and regularity into the events of nature (Ps. 148 : 6), but as the Almighty He is free and sovereign with respect to everything that He Himself has bound to order and regularity.¹

With the above in mind, we should like to define the concept as follows:

A miracle is a direct act of God in which He reveals to mankind, with an intention, a new observable reality, which can only be fully understood by faith. In this new reality God proclaims, outside and against the known laws of order and regularity in nature, His freedom, power and love.

¹ GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 265, points out that the early Christians "insisted upon the power and the freedom of God. This is the primary factor in all the miracle stories with which we have been concerned. These stories are intended to show not only that God can control nature and human history, but that he actually does so."

II. MIRACLES AND SCIENCE

The question of the relation between miracles and the natural sciences is a facet of the great problem of faith and science. Each new generation is faced with this question in a different fashion, since the progress of science confronts man constantly with new issues and creates new tension between faith and science, between the belief in miracles and scientific knowledge. In this work we cannot consider every aspect of this extensive problem, but we must not fail to draw attention to the important pronouncement by BRUNNER, who says that the essential decision in this matter does not lie in the realm of the intellect, but in the sphere of man's freedom. "The question of Jesus Christ, of the miracle of his revelation, is decided not between causality and miracle, but between the freedom of God and the freedom of man."¹

Although the following chapter, which deals with miracles and medicine, is essentially bound up with this one, we have preferred a separate treatment. This has been done both for methodical reasons—after all, we make a distinction between the nature miracles and the healing miracles of Jesus—and also because there are other possible interpretations for the healing miracles than for the nature miracles.

When one is not a scientific specialist, one is assailed more or less by a feeling of helplessness when obliged to venture into a field scattered with the mantraps of complicated theories and incomprehensible equations. The theologian must beware of speaking with "technical knowledge," or of presuming to express an opinion on technical details.² If, in connection with our subject, we never-

¹ BRUNNER, *Offenbarung u. Vernunft*, p. 305 . . . "Glaube und Unglaube an Jesus Christus entscheidet sich nicht in der intellektuellen Sphäre der Wunderproblematik" (p. 303). "Wer dem göttlichen Anspruch Jesu ausweicht, tut es nicht, 'weil er nicht an Wunder glauben kann,' sondern weil er ihm gegenüber seine eigenherrliche Freiheit behaupten will" (p. 304) . . . In an article: "Wissen und Glauben als Bundesgenossen in der heutigen Zeit" (in "Die Natur das Wunder Gottes," p. 36 ff.), in which B. BAYINK contrasts the recent past with the present, he strikes an optimistic note: "Die Zeiten haben sich gewandelt. Über die Religion im allgemeinen und das Christentum im besonderen zu spotten, es also überhaupt nicht mehr ernst zu nehmen (wie sich damals nicht nur die Mehrzahl der Wissenschaftler, sondern jeder 'gebildete' Pennäler oder Backfisch leisten zu müssen glaubte), ist heute nur noch in sehr kleinen Kreisen üblich." See also LUDWIG, *Das naturwissenschaftliche Weltbild des Christen*.

² DOKTER, *Het mythologische, het theoretische en het bijbelse wereldbeeld*,

theless endeavour to say something about the relation between miracles and science, we do so because both modern physicists and natural philosophers on the one hand and theologians on the other hold views and utter hypotheses, in consequence of the latest developments in science, which directly concern the problem of miracles.

Although the term "natural science" is a collective noun—*realia* or natural sciences—we shall pay particular attention to physics, since the problem is in sharp focus in this branch of science. Physics, chemistry and biology are, as a matter of fact, gradually growing closer together as three basic sciences of inanimate and animate nature, each active in its own way.¹

It is known that the Biblical cosmology is different from the present one. BULTMANN begins his celebrated study of "Entmythologisierung" with the following words, which have gradually become famous:

p. 37, recalls the pronouncement of the German physicist and theologian Dr. Howe, who advises the theologian to keep to his own subject and not to acquire a dilettante knowledge of science . . . This is doubtless true, with the restriction that the non-expert who has to enter another field of study than his own in view of a certain investigation must be permitted to have access to what he needs for his investigation. He will then see for himself that he is a layman, and note how far he can go in his observations and conclusions . . . BETH has made an important comment in this respect in his *Naturphilosophie* (a work of which many pages remain "closed" to the non-specialist!). He says that there are various systems of logical syntax. He wonders whether there is a means "of facilitating a more intimate understanding between the so-called intellectual and the natural sciences" (p. 149). He goes on: "I do in fact see such a means; it can be found in the combination of logical research and training in logic" (p. 150). Beth then advocates the learning of the syntactical rules, the "grammar", which hold good for other subjects than one's own. It must be realized that "these rules are not the same for all sciences, so that theological reasoning cannot be judged by the same standards as reasoning in physics" (p. 150). Effectively he argues: "In my opinion, therefore, the training in logic of the practitioners of the various sciences may lead to the disappearance of overspecialization, professional chauvinism and one-sidedness, about which complaints are so often heard. Specialization, concentration on a particular branch of science in which one is productively employed, will of course not disappear, nor can it be dispensed with. But it will be possible for the research-worker to form an independent opinion on problems which do not belong to that branch of science in which he has specialized" (p. 150 ff.).

¹ HEISENBERG, *Wandlungen in den Grundlagen der Naturwissenschaft*, p. 85: "So schliessen sich durch die Entwicklung der letzten Jahrzehnte Biologie, Physik und Chemie enger zusammen." Cf. JONES-ROTBLAT-WHITROW, *Atoms and the Universe*, Introduction: "The development of biology has been a gradual change from mere classification, through the emergence of general principles such as those of the evolutionary theory, to a synthesis with physics and chemistry . . . What we choose to regard as the boundary between living and non-living is purely a matter of convention" (p. 21).

"The New Testament's cosmology is mythical. The world is believed to be divided into three storeys. In the centre is the earth, with Heaven above it and the underworld below it. Heaven is the house of God and the heavenly beings, the angels; the underworld is Hell, the place of torment." BULTMANN goes on to argue that in the view of the Ancients all earthly events were governed by supernatural powers, and then says that this is all "mythological talk, incredible to modern man because the mythological cosmology is a thing of the past for him." It is pointless—and impossible—to force it upon him, because it simply does not exist any longer; the situation has changed.¹ BULTMANN is right when he endeavours to confront contemporary Christendom with the new scientific

¹ BULTMANN in *Kerygma u. Mythos*, I, p. 15 ff. Cf. WHITEHEAD, *Science and the Modern World*, Ch. XII, *Religion and Science*, pp. 210-223, especially p. 220. BRUNNER, *op. cit.*, p. 273 ff. The Biblical concept of space can no more be maintained than the Biblical concept of time. "Das geozentrische Weltbild der Bibel ist durch die neuere Astrophysik als unhaltbar erwiesen" (p. 274). VRIEZEN, *Hoofddlijnen der Theologie v.h. O.T.*, p. 197, says that it is "foolish" to try and preserve the cosmology of the O.T. "as an element of revelation in the O.T.; it is derived in its entirety from the ancient Oriental cosmology, and is valueless as Divine revelation. It is therefore out of the question that this 'Biblical' cosmology should be apologetically defended against the modern scientific one for the sake of faith." LERLE, *Das Raumverständnis im N.T.*, is of the opinion that one can hardly speak of an Old Testament "cosmology" in the sense of a Babylonian or Greek one. According to Lerle the cosmological pictures in the O.T. serve exclusively to indicate the power of God. "Die Kosmologie des AT ist einfach und durchsichtig: Die Welt ist eine Schöpfung Gottes . . . Der Raum des AT ist nicht selbstständig genug, um sich zu einem Weltbild zu verdichten" (p. 49 f.). In later Judaism, however, an increasing interest in cosmological problems may be observed (p. 51 ff.). "Ein Einfluss babylonischer Elemente, besonders des ptolemäischen Weltbildes, ist unverkennbar. Die Visionen und Himmelreisen der Apokalyptiker sind abhängig von der hellenistischen Astronomie" (p. 113). In the N.T., on the other hand, we encounter the viewpoint of the O.T. This world is: "Gottes Fusschemel. Daher kann sich Jesus auch in Fragen, die Gottes eigenen Bereich berühren, unbekümmert einer massiven dreidimensionalen Raumvorstellung überall dort bedienen, wo dies die Grösse des Handelns Gottes am Menschen zeigt. Wo aber die räumliche Struktur dem Einbruch des Reiches Gottes hinderlich wird, kann sie mit Leichtigkeit durchbrochen werden" (p. 84). "Die Welt ist der Amboss Gottes. Das ist die Summa des neutestamentlichen Raumverständnisses" (p. 109). Needless to say, Lerle comes into conflict with Bultmann. "Es ist eine völlige Verkennung des neutestamentlichen Sachverhalts, wenn man das babylonische Raumverständnis und Bultmanns Theorie von den drei Stockwerken in das NT hineinliest. Die drei Schichten: Unterwelt, Erdoberfläche und höhere Regionen decken sich durchaus nicht mit dem Land der Dämonen, dem Himmelreich und dem Reich der Menschen. Das gesamte Gefüge von drei Dimensionen ist Herrschaftsbereich der bösen Geister. Dieses Gefüge nennen aber nicht nur wir, sondern nennt auch der antike Mensch Kosmos" (p. 105).

views; he is not right in the conclusions that he draws. DOKTER says that the Biblical cosmology is neither that of the Ptolemaic system nor that of pagan mythology. "Biblical man has the atheoretical, prescientific cosmology that almost all of us have, and that also the modern astronomer has for daily use. Without any pang of his scientific conscience, the latter speaks of a beautiful sunset." The modern cosmology is constantly changing. "It is successively that of Ptolemy, of Copernicus, of Newton and of Einstein, and another more modern one will certainly come."¹

It will be readily understood that when modern research destroyed the basis of the so-called "eternal" laws of nature, many scholars began to wonder whether this might not open up possibilities for miracles. For the strictly scientific view of miracles is closely interwoven with what is understood by the concept of causality.²

We shall now briefly examine the problem of miracles and science as it has occurred throughout the ages.

The history of physics is divided into three periods, viz. the ancient one that began with Thales of Miletus, ca. 600 B.C.; the classical one, that was ushered in by the publication of Newton's *Principia* in 1687, and the modern one, which dates from 1900, when Planck announced his quantum theory.³ In each of these periods, with their development and transitional phases, man was confronted with the problem of miracles and science, and sometimes in a painful way!

(a) *The ancient period*

Although the boundary between the natural and the supernatural was not so rigidly drawn in the ancient world as nowadays, it may

¹ DOKTER, op. cit., p. 20 ff. See VON WEIZSÄCKER, *Zum Weltbild der Physik*, p. 124 ff., on the succession of cosmologies.

² TENNANT, *Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions*: "It is solely in respect of mode of causation that we can distinguish between the natural event and the supernatural" (p. 61).

³ See the very instructive and, for the theologian, important work by DIJKSTERHUIS, *De mechanisering van het wereldbeeld*, p. 3. The "distinction between ancient, classical and modern, in which classical is therefore emphatically not used in the sense envisaged when one speaks of classical Antiquity, but in that in which contemporary physicists tend to use the word, applies not only to mechanics, but, also under its influence, to the whole of physics . . . Classical science is the product of a gradual transition from ancient science and, as has always happened in the development of thoughts on nature, it has not needed to reject or disregard various results achieved in the preceding period, but has been able to take them over after appropriate transformation."

not be asserted that the Ancients were unaware of any natural order. Perhaps it would be better to speak of "forces of nature" than of "laws of nature."¹ Not only were the means of experimentation rather limited, but the Greek passion for speculation forced experiments into the background. Consequently, with the Greek philosophers, the Ionics, Democritus, Aristotle, and others, physics and natural philosophy merged into one, which does not alter the fact that for instance Aristotle, Archimedes and Ptolemy gave or indicated certain "laws" in a number of fields. These forces or laws of nature in general formed no obstacle to belief in the direct or indirect intervention of higher forces. Supernatural power was just as real as natural power. But there was no absence of critical voices regarding supernatural powers; cf. Cicero and Lucianus.²

¹ See KAFKA, *Naturgesetz, Freiheit u. Wunder*, p. 54 ff. . . . GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, remarks that the first example of the use of the word *physis* in Greek literature is to be found in Homer, *Od.* VIII, 303. In the pre-Socratic philosophers it usually means "the essence of something," and less frequently the "force" or "origin" of something. "*Physis* means the process of growth, a growing thing (the totality of growing things), and that which originates the process. It also comes to mean the 'normal' healthy state of a living and growing thing" (p. 5). In Plato we often encounter the antithesis of "nature" and "law," the latter in the sense of moral law, behaviour. "He often uses the expressions 'according to nature' and 'contrary to nature' in reference to human behaviour. This use reflects the idea of nature as a normal, healthy state" (p. 5). In his *Metaphysica* Aristotle gives a careful analysis of the concept "*physis*" (p. 6 f.). According to Grant "the earliest actual occurrence" of the expression "law of nature" is ascribed to the Sophist Callicles in Plato's *Gorgias*. In his *Timaios* Plato says that disease is "contrary to the laws of nature." Law of nature is here identical with "nature." It is evident from the interpretation of both references that Plato does not mean the concept "law of nature" in the modern sense (p. 20). "The earliest examples of 'laws of nature' in the physical sense seem to occur in the writings of Philo of Alexandria. Most of the 'laws of nature' to which he refers are moral laws which have their primary source in God who is the creator of nature." (p. 23) . . . The oldest Christian writers—Justin, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, etc.—interpret the concept "law of nature" exclusively in the moral sense. "On the other hand, when Christian writers touch upon physical 'laws of nature' they are exceedingly sceptical" (p. 24).

² See Section I B, *Miracles as a Problem* . . . Cf. the opinion which King Herod voiced in a speech to his soldiers in connection with an earthquake in Judea. Disasters come from heaven and from earth, says Herod, but they may never dishearten the Jews, FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *De bello Jud.* I, XIX, 4 . . . As regards the views of the Greeks, see DIJKSTERHUIS, *op. cit.*, Ch. II: "Hoofdstromingen van het Griekse wijsgerig denken over de natuur." In the chapter "*Natuurwetenschap en Christendom*," pp. 98-105, Dijksterhuis describes how the problem occurred in patristics. The Fathers were not in principle opposed to the study of nature. But they found it more or less superfluous, and sometimes dangerous. Tertullian argued: "For us a thirst for knowledge is no longer needed since Jesus Christ, nor research since the Gospel" (*Tert., Liber de Praescriptione*

From the point of view of scientific progress, the Middle Ages present a rather depressing picture. But care should be taken not to paint the Middle Ages in *too* sombre colours! On the one hand medieval man wished to retain Biblical pronouncements on natural events; on the other hand the scholars, who mainly belonged to the clergy, were constantly faced with new problems as a result of the progress of thought and knowledge. These problems led to conflicts with the doctrine of the Church, i.e. with the then interpretation of Holy Writ, so that these scholars were repeatedly obliged to hunt for compromises. During the transition from the Greek period to the early Middle Ages, however, we already encounter various independent minds who did not wish to disown their scientific views, for instance Gerbert of Aurillac, who later became Pope Sylvester II (pope from 999 to 1003), the scholars of the school of Chartres founded by Fulbert, etc.¹ The term "Dark Ages" should therefore not be taken too literally!

Haereticorum, c. 7: "nobis curiositate non opus est, post Christum Jesum; nec inquisitione; post Evangelium"). Science should always remain subject to the authority of Holy Writ. "Augustine emphatically pronounces this principle as it were in the name of all Fathers, and in so doing imposes bonds on scientific research for which it has to make allowance century after century" (p. 100). See also GRANT, op. cit., p. 87 ff., "Science in Hellenistic Judaism and Christianity." After his investigation Grant concludes that "in orthodox writers of the second century there is practically no interest in science. Theology dominates their minds to the exclusion of almost everything else . . . Only at Rome among a small group of dynamistic monarchians was there any interest in secular learning" (p. 103). "By the end of the fourth century Christian interest in natural science, like natural science itself, was practically dead" (p. 118) . . . As regards the views of the Greeks see also VAN MELSEN, *Van Atomos naar Atoom*, pp. 3-43, *De Griekse wijsbegeerte*.

¹ DIJKSTERHUIS, op. cit., p. 114: "Like many another medieval scholar with a considerable interest in science, Gerbert was not spared the reputation of being an adept of the black art of magic. Within a century after his death a legend had already formed about him, in which everything that he had brought about and achieved, including his elevation to the Holy See, was ascribed to the aid of Satan" . . . Cf. BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK-LINDEBOOM, *Handboek der Kerkgeschiedenis*, I, p. 204. Gerbert had studied in Spain, where among other things he had made the acquaintance of the doctrine of Islam. See DIJKSTERHUIS, op. cit., p. 120 ff., "De bijdrage van de Islam." Dijksterhuis explains how the fourteenth century was dominated by a spirit of criticism and doubt, as a result of which science enjoyed a favourable atmosphere. The groups of scholars called upon to explain themselves by the ecclesiastical authorities apologized for their theologically disputable propositions by saying that they had only arrived at their pronouncements as a result of a desire to engage in disputation (*militare in scholis*). An example is Nicholas of Autrecourt, who in 1346 was obliged by the University of Paris to withdraw a number of propositions which had caused offence. He did so readily, and with his own hands thrust his works into the

The Schoolmen clung to Aristotle's metaphysics and took great pains to give reasonable proof of the truths of the Christian faith.¹ They tried, under the guidance of the Church, to eliminate discrepancies between faith and science. Independent research was strictly supervised on the spot, and even forbidden! In 1163 Pope Alexander III, in collaboration with the Council of Tours, forbade all clerics to study physics, under penalty of excommunication.² Those who practised science on their own discretion were stigmatized as wizards and magicians.³ For the central issue in the Middle Ages was not the "how" but the "why" of things; the approach was not mathematical, but teleological.⁴ The problem of miracles and science was solved by the Schoolmen as follows: God works in two ways in nature, viz. naturally, regularly, and supernaturally, irregularly, the latter by way of exception. The later Protestant dogmatists borrowed this view.

The breadth of thought among the old Reformers is illustrated

flames, which, however, in no way impeded the dissemination of his ideas (p. 186).

¹ See BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK-LINDEBOOM, *op. cit.*, I, p. 258 f. Received at first with great distrust, Aristotle soon became the spiritual architect of the Roman Catholic doctrinal structure (Thomas Aquinas). DIJKSTERHUIS, *op. cit.*, p. 139 ff. Popes Honorius III, Gregory IX and Urban IV tried to prevent the teaching of Aristotelian metaphysics. However, thanks above all to the Franciscans and the Dominicans, the pagan philosopher Aristotle became the *praecursor Christi in naturalibus*. Dijksterhuis points to the dangers which this intimate relation between faith and science brought in its train. "Every discovery of scientific errors which undermined Aristotle's authority would from then on indirectly undermine the Church, which had identified that authority with its own" (p. 143).

² TITRUS, *Natur u. Gott*. p. 185: "1209 untersagte ein Pariser Konzil den Mönchen das Lesen physikalischer Schriften; weitere Verbote folgten. Es war die vom Islam herüberkommende naturphilosophische Welle, welche diese wie andere Gegenmassnahmen der Kirche hervorrief." Cf. DIJKSTERHUIS, *op. cit.*, p. 178, for a violent conflict. In 1277 Etienne Tempier, Bishop of Paris, published a decree condemning a number of philosophical and scientific tenets. In 1325 this decree was rescinded, but it had a restraining influence on the study of philosophy "and also clearly intervened in the development of scientific ideas."

³ As was Gerbert of Aurillac . . . DIJKSTERHUIS, *op. cit.*, p. 176, believes that Albertus Magnus, who engaged in a study of the wonders of magic, and therefore had not too good a reputation, was probably for this reason not already canonized in the Middle Ages, as was his pupil Thomas, but only in 1931.

⁴ Cf. SULLIVAN, *The Bases of Modern Science*. "The 'why' of phenomena, not the 'how' of phenomena, was the question that interested the mediaeval mind. The mediaeval universe was informed through and through with purpose—all things conspired together towards some divine end . . . According to the mediaevalist nature is teleological; according to science it is mathematical . . . The mediaeval assumption fitted in with a completely general metaphysical and religious outlook" (p. 10 f.).

by their positive appreciation of the study of science. Melancthon considers the love of learning about nature an innate and healthy property whilst in his opinion the teaching of mathematics is good training in methodical thought. Luther is in favour of the teaching of music and the whole of mathematics. He praises the science of astronomy and believes "that a star is greater than the whole world." He is, however, very reserved towards pseudo-sciences such as astrology and alchemy.¹

The Roman Catholic doctrinal system could not hold back the rising tide. One invention followed another, and science began to wrest itself free from the grip of the Church. A new period was beginning. As DIJKSTERHUIS says, these were "the years in which for the various branches of science there really begins the renovation which introduces the classical period and thus prepares the way for modern development." It was a clearly defined period, which began in 1543 with the work of Copernicus, *De revolutionibus orbium coelestium*, and ended in 1687 with Newton's *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica*. "It brings staggering progress in human knowledge and abilities, and thus a radical change in man's outlook on life and the world; as a result it forms a clear division between Antiquity and the Middle Ages on the one hand and the as yet unnamed and unclassified centuries to which our days also belong on the other."²

Copernicus (1473-1543) propounded the view that the sun is the centre of our planetary system, which meant the end of the geocentricism of the Middle Ages. Under the influence of his research, Galileo (1564-1642) continued the scientific search and made numerous new discoveries. However, his affinity of mind with Copernicus

¹ TITIUS, op. cit., p. 215 . . . Titius characterizes the difference in appraisal of the study of science as follows: "Den Alten galt es nicht nur für unnütz, sondern auch für gefährlich, im Grunde für irreligiös, noch etwas zu suchen, nachdem die christliche Wahrheit da ist. Augustin begehrt nach seinem berühmten Worte, Gott und die Seele zu erkennen, sonst nichts, durchaus nichts." Titius says that by this Augustine goes to the heart of the matter, religiously speaking. "Aber der Gelehrte soll nach reformatorischer Auffassung auf seinem Gebiete nicht Gott und die Seele, sondern seinen besonderen Gegenstand erforschen; dieser sein Dienst entfremdet ihn nicht Gott, sondern ist selbst Gottesdienst; damit erst ist dem wissenschaftlichen Arbeiter das gute Gewissen gegeben."

² DIJKSTERHUIS, op. cit., p. 317 . . . Cf. JAMES, *The Nature and Function of Priesthood*, Ch. VII: *Priesthood and Sacred Learning*, pp. 208-245. In the last section, *The Disintegration of Sacred Learning*, James advocates "an effective relationship" between "sacred and secular learning."

brought down upon his head the enmity of the Church, for after all, as declared at Rome in 1616, the theory of the earth's motion was "foolish and absurd." But even a period of enforced residence in a dungeon did not make him abandon his views.¹ "He died in the year in which Newton was born. Here lies the birthday feast of our new times," wrote Goethe. Johann Kepler (1571-1630) ventured on the daring enterprise of describing nature mathematically in his three laws of planetary motion.² And yet Kepler's and Galileo's cosmology was still a uniform one, says HEISENBERG; they were still concerned with knowing God's works in nature.³

(b) *The classical period*

With the discoveries and theories of Isaac Newton (1643-1727), physics persevered with its method of strictly mathematical and mechanical explanation, though the new cosmology did not displace the image of God in Newton's mind.⁴ But, as the inventions and

¹ DIJKSTERHUIS, op. cit., p. 419 ff. In 1610 the world of scholars was startled by the publication of Galileo's book *Nuncius Sidereus*, or *Message of the Stars*. At first little credence was given to the accounts of his discoveries in the heavens by means of a telescope. But soon the theologians opposed Galileo's work. On 24 February, 1616, there followed the condemnation of what was considered to be the essence of the Copernican system. In 1632 Galileo published a new work, which was "one continuous and outspoken defence of the Copernican system" . . . In our opinion the trial of Galileo is clear proof of the proposition that with regard to science the Church has to abstain from a *definitio absoluta*. Reference may be made to the prosecution of a number of Greek philosophers in the fifth and sixth centuries B.C. on the charge of "godlessness" (*asebeia*); see among others NESTLE, *Vom Mythos zum Logos*, p. 480 ff., and GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 43 f. . . . WHITE, *Histoire de la Lutte entre la Science et la Théologie*, p. 13. White points to the violent opposition of the Church to Copernicus, Galileo, Descartes, etc. See DIJKSTERHUIS, op. cit., p. 459 f., for Descartes' irresolute attitude.

² SULLIVAN, op. cit.: "Kepler was convinced that Nature was necessarily mathematical" (p. 12).

³ HEISENBERG, *Wandlungen in den Grundlagen der Naturwissenschaft*, p. 71. VAN MIERLO, *La Science, La Raison et la Foi*, p. 176 f.: "Képler ne savait pas comment remercier Dieu pour lui avoir montré les merveilles de ses lois" (*Harmonice Mundi*, Lib. V). TITUS, op. cit., p. 225, says that Kepler so little doubts the full truth of Holy Writ: "dass er auf Grund von Jos. 10 eine Unterbrechung der Erdbewegung annimmt" . . . Copernicus also thanked God for his discoveries. "Il était heureux, parce que son système était plus 'digne' de Dieu que les systèmes précédents," he says in his "De Revolutionibus Orbium Caelestium," see VAN MIERLO, op. cit., p. 176. Cf. DIJKSTERHUIS, op. cit., p. 335 ff. on Kepler.

⁴ VAN MIERLO, op. cit., p. 177: "Newton créa la physique mathématique et démontra que le monde était une merveille mathématique qui plaçait l'esprit au-dessus de la matière et nécessitait Dieu . . . Bentley fonda ses fameux sermons contre l'athéisme sur les *Principia Mathematica* de Newton." Cf. DIJKSTERHUIS, op. cit., p. 509 ff., in particular p. 534.

theories poured into the world, so the idea grew in countless minds that every natural event could be reduced to mechanical laws, eternal laws of nature. It was imagined that the cosmology obtained had been founded for all times on the three pillars of causality, continuity and objectifiability. It was believed that when by certain methods a connection between two things had been established as absolutely valid, one could speak of a "law of nature" possessing absolute validity, i.e. the past, present and future were contained in this law: there was continuity, a fixed and regular course of things on the principle of "*natura non facit saltus*," nature makes no jumps.¹ These laws were regarded as "objective," since they had been given with "objective reality," so that they were regarded as independent of the human mind. In this way natural events were enmeshed in a system: the cosmology was "closed"! And via this rationalistic way of reasoning, partially under the inspiration of the philosophical, social and political trends in the nineteenth century, a materialistic and atheistic outlook on life gradually came into being. Man around 1900, who believed that he had conquered space, accepted only what could be measured, counted and weighed. Büchner, Hæckel, Ostwald, Vogt and many other adherents of materialism were inimical to Church and religion.² "It is true that technical perfection reached a climax, but spiritual life suffered great harm: belief in science ousted belief in everything that was not purely intellectual; it gradually ousted belief in God or in religion and in the existence of the soul," says GEBSER.³ And if there was no place for God,

¹ VON WEIZSÄCKER, *Zum Weltbild der Physik*, p. 76: "Ist der Zustand eines abgeschlossenen Systems in einem Zeitpunkt vollständig bekannt, so ist damit grundsätzlich auch sein Zustand in jedem anderen Zeitpunkt bestimmt." This is the causality principle of determinism. Cf. p. 89.

² See HARTMANN, *Naturwissenschaft u. Religion*, p. 3. Cf. STANGE, *Christentum u. moderne Weltanschauung*. Nature has become a force replacing religion. "Es ist nicht die wissenschaftliche Methode als solche, welche die Religion als eine Sache der Einbildung und das Christentum als einen überwundenen Standpunkt erscheinen lässt. Es ist vielmehr nur die einseitige Vorherrschaft einer bestimmten Methode der Wissenschaft, welche zu dieser Beurteilung der Religion führt" (p. 115). JORDAN, *De causale verklaring van het leven*, p. 21 ff.

³ GEBSER, *Abendländische Wandlung*, p. 27 f. . . . NOORDENBOS, *Het Atheïsme in Nederland in de negentiende eeuw*, characterizes the spiritual situation in Holland as follows: "The basis on which free-thinking and gradually modern Theology proceeded to establish itself was the acceptance of the scientific cosmology, the rejection of supranaturalism, i.e. the denial of the arbitrary intervention of a Power transcending the world in the causal relation which science assumes in its search for and application of the laws of nature. In the historical field this

where would there be a place for miracles? ¹ But since the beginning of the twentieth century the conception of a closed cosmology has been cruelly and violently shattered, so violently, indeed, that this entire cosmology is now designated as "classical." ²

The physics of the twentieth century followed entirely new paths. According to HEISENBERG this development was not caused by revolutionary ideas, and therefore cannot be compared with the change wrought by Copernicus. The modern theories are the product of the attempt "to carry through consistently the programme of classical physics." ³

(c) *The modern period*

The fourteenth of December, 1900, was an important day in the history of physics. For on that day Max Planck gave a lecture in Berlin on the quantum theory. According to Planck light is trans-

therefore means the rejection as unhistorical of that transmitted history which tells of events in conflict with the cosmology formed by science" (p. 88).

¹ CAIRNS, *The Faith that Rebels*: "The whole conception of physical nature as a closed system, if it be taken as an ultimate account, is, indeed, fatal to any really religious interpretation of life. The failure to understand this is the gravest error of the modernist compromise" (p. 101 f.).

² VON WEIZSÄCKER, *op. cit.*, p. 84: "Als 'klassische Physik' bezeichnet man heute die Newtonsche Mechanik, die Maxwellsche Elektrodynamik und alle die Disziplinen, die sich durch irgendeine modellmässige Deutung ihrer Grundphänomene auf Mechanik und Elektrodynamik zurückführen lassen; so die Akustik (auf Grund der Deutung des Schalls als Wellenbewegung), die Wärmelehre (auf Grund der kinetischen Theorie der Wärme), die Optik (auf Grund der elektromagnetischen Lichttheorie)." Cf. HEISENBERG, *op. cit.*, who says of classical physics: "Es entstand die Vorstellung einer objektiven, in Zeit und Raum sich abspielenden körperlichen Welt, die einer Maschine vergleichbar dem ersten Anstoss nach unabänderlichen Gesetzen folgt. Die Tatsache, dass diese Maschine ebenso wie die ganze Naturwissenschaft selbst wieder ein Produkt des menschlichen Geistes war, erschien als unwesentlich und für das Verständnis der Natur belanglos" (p. 18).

³ HEISENBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 7 ff.: "Die Wandlung der Grundlagen der exakten Naturwissenschaft, die sich in der modernen Physik vollzogen hat, ist Schritt für Schritt durch experimentelle Untersuchungen erzwungen worden." Cf. DIJKSTERHUIS, *op. cit.*, p. 550. The great gap is that which lies between Aristotelian science and the classical version, not that between the classical and the modern. Questions relating to the essence of things, substantial thought, had to be exchanged for functional thought, which "tries to establish the behaviour of things in relation to one another." Dijksterhuis concludes his *Final Observations* with the words: "The mechanization which the cosmology underwent in the transition from ancient to classical science consisted in the introduction of a description of nature by means of the mathematical concepts of classical mechanics; it means the beginning of the mathematization of science, which finds completion in the physics of the twentieth century."

mitted in very small particles, in certain quantities. He called these particles quanta, atoms of luminous energy. Partly as a result of Planck's discovery, both Newton's theory (the transmission of light by particles) and that of Huygens (the transmission of light by waves) present themselves in a different light.¹ It is both beyond our capabilities and beyond the scope of our subject to go deeper into this complicated matter; what is important for us is that as a result of the rapid succession of discoveries the old concept of causality received a shock.² Einstein's theory of relativity and Planck's quantum theory together form, according to GEBSER, "the foundations of the new science."³ For what was the case? Physics found itself confronted both in the macrocosm and in the microcosm with unprecedented problems. It was noted in the microcosm that the same object has two different manifestations, which apparently preclude one another, viz. that of "particle" and that of "wave" or "field." This means that one and the same electron proves to be a particle and a "wave packet." Now a particle can only move at random in one direction, whereas a wave can travel in all directions, unless a certain cause dictates the direction.⁴ The question now is: does an arbitrary process occur in the atom which cannot be measured in any way at all—which would mean that the idea of

¹ DIJKSTERHUIS makes an interesting comment, op. cit., p. 507. He protests against authors of physics textbooks who write about Huygens' theory of light without having read the *Traité de la Lumière*! For this work speaks nowhere of vibrations. "Of course there is no objection to speaking of Huygens' wave theory, provided that wave is interpreted in the general sense of the propagation of a disturbance of equilibrium and not in the particular sense of a vibration, and provided that in connection with this every idea of periodicity is abandoned."

² See among others GEBSER, op. cit., p. 45 ff.; LAMBERECHTS, *Het nieuwe physische wereldbeeld*, p. 46 ff.; VAN MELSEN, *Van atomos naar atoom*, p. 184 ff.; BAVINK, *Das Weltbild der heutigen Naturwissenschaften*, p. 69 ff.

³ GEBSER, op. cit., p. 45: "Sie ergänzen sich auf die wunderbarste Weise; sie sind die beiden grossartigen Gedankengebäude, welche die materialistische Wissenschaft des vergangenen Jahrhunderts in ihren Grundfesten erschütterten und gänzlich revolutionierten. Diese zwei Theorien haben dem Menschen eine ganz neue Auffassung des Universums als einer 'Ganzheit' gegeben und gänzlich neuartige Beziehungen zwischen dem Menschen und der Welt, in der er lebt, geschaffen."

⁴ Cf. VON WEIZSÄCKER, op. cit., p. 86 ff. "Habe ich ein Elektron soeben an einem bestimmten Ort vorgefunden, so sagt das Teilchenbild: an diesem Ort ist ein Teilchen; das Wellenbild: hier ist ein auf engstem Raum zusammengedrängtes 'Wellenpaket.' Beide Darstellungen sind richtig und widersprechen einander nicht. Aber nach einiger Zeit müsste das Teilchen in irgendeiner Richtung davongelaufen sein, das Wellenpaket hingegen sich nach allen Richtungen ausgebreitet haben" (p. 87).

"causal determinism" would have to be abandoned and that one could speak of "freedom"—or are our instruments not yet sensitive enough to detect such processes? Or must we assume that the process can never be absolutely established by measurement, precisely because measuring influences the course of the phenomena? It was a maxim of classical physics that at a certain point the system is closed, and one can speak of objective and absolute. The new physics is faced with the relative, that is to say allowance must be made not only for what must be known and determined, the object, but also for the determining element, i.e. the observer and his instruments, the subjective element.¹ There is a relation between object and subject that cannot be eliminated; they can be separated from each other in abstracto, but not in concreto. Here we also approach a philosophical problem, which has been considered by HEIM, among others.²

Let us return to "particle" and "wave." Is any degree of certainty possible here? On this point the physicist HEISENBERG has made an important pronouncement. He has established that it is impossible to make an accurate calculation in all respects. For an electron position and velocity can never be calculated simultaneously. It is therefore not possible to give an exact temporal-spatial description. For

¹ VON WEIZSÄCKER, *op. cit.*, p. 91: "Es ist der entscheidende Unterschied der Quantenmechanik von der klassischen Physik, dass sie ihre Sätze gar nicht aussprechen kann, ohne die Art der Kenntnis mit auszudrücken." VON WEIZSÄCKER, *Atomenergie u. Atomzeitalter*, p. 59: "Die Wechselwirkung des Beobachters mit dem Atom ist einer der Grundbegriffe in der Analyse der heutigen Physik."

² HEIM, *Der christliche Gottesglaube u. die Naturwissenschaft*, p. 130 ff. "Die heutige Physik hat immer deutlicher erkannt—das zeigt sich zum Beispiel an Heisenbergs Unbestimmtheitsrelationen—, dass der physikalische Tatbestand gar nicht vollständig beschrieben und exakt definiert werden kann, ohne dass das erkennende Subjekt von vornherein mit in die Beschreibung hineingenommen wird. Damit hat die heutige Physik den Grundgedanken der kantischen Erkenntniskritik in überraschender Weise bestätigt, dass es keine gegenständliche Erfahrung gibt, die nicht die Erfahrung eines Subjektes ist, dem die Wirklichkeit gegenständlich gegenübertritt. Ich und Gegenstand können zwar durch eine Abstraktion voneinander unterschieden, aber nicht konkret voneinander gesondert werden" (p. 136). Cf. OVINK, *De Zekerheid der menselijke kennis*, Ch. 4, Sect. 3: "De logische en psychologische grondslagen van het natuurkennis," p. 472 ff. Ovink says that science, which is concerned with the non-self, wishes to emancipate the "self." But that cannot be done. Its "things" always remain "things for us," i.e. Erscheinungen. "One's ideas on science are ultimately determined by one's ideas on the human spirit" (p. 508) . . . See also WEIZSÄCKER, *op. cit.*, p. 104 ff. HARTMANN, *Naturwissenschaft u. Religion*, p. 5 ff. BURGERS, *Trekken van de moderne Westerse wetenschap*; summary p. 12 ff. WENZL, *Die philosophischen Grenzfragen der modernen Naturwissenschaft*, p. 58 ff. KOCKELMANN, *Phaenomenologie en Natuurwetenschap*.

to determine the position of the electron, measurements are necessary, and these have to be made by means of ultra-short waves, which have a direct effect on the position and velocity of the electron. The effect of the subject thus makes it impossible to arrive at an absolutely objective determination.¹ HEISENBERG wishes to reckon with observable things. The atom can no longer be objectified as a thing in space; only the results of observations can be objectified, but they never give a completely graphic picture.²

In this situation concepts entered physics which before then had been lavishly employed only in the intellectual sciences, and particularly in theology (see the commentaries!), viz. "uncertainty" and "probability." The "uncertainty principle" demonstrated by Werner HEISENBERG, the element of indeterminism, has been eagerly accepted by many as a support for religion and belief in miracles. Whilst physicists accept the view of "particle" and "wave" as each other's complement and quietly carry on with their work, natural philosophers and theologians draw conclusions which can no longer be called exactly scientific, but which are meant to serve an outlook on life. Modern physics recognizes particle structure in the phenomena of electricity (electrons and positrons), in radiation phenomena, and in the phenomena of matter (protons, neutrons and mesons). The hopes of the Ancient Greeks have now been fulfilled, says HEISENBERG. We have found "that there really is only one element forming all that is real. If we have to give this element a name, we would now simply call it 'energy'."³ For the next few years the task

¹ NEUBERG, *Das naturwissenschaftliche Weltbild der Gegenwart*, p. 53. Cf. SULLIVAN, *op. cit.*, p. 195 f.; LAMBERECHTS, *op. cit.*, p. 80 ff.; VAN MIERLO, *op. cit.*, p. 126 f.; HARTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 16 ff.; VAN MELSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 176 ff.; DOKTER, *op. cit.*, p. 30: "Physics is aware that it has no objective knowledge of the elementary constituents of matter. The experiments in which these particles are observed change the situation and nature of the particles. The final reality of the microcosm does not become known as it 'is', but as it appears in the experiment. The physicist recognizes the limits of his knowledge in microphysics." KOCKELMANS, *op. cit.*, p. 154 ff.

² HEISENBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 80: "Das Atom kann nicht mehr ohne Vorbehalt als ein Ding im Raum, das sich in der Zeit in einer angebbaren Weise verändert, objektiviert werden. Nur die Resultate einzelner Beobachtungen lassen sich objektivieren; aber sie geben nie ein vollständiges anschauliches Bild. Daraus geht hervor, dass die Vorstellung von der Realität, die der Newtonschen Mechanik zugrunde lag, zu eng war und durch etwas weiteres ersetzt werden muss." See also HEISENBERG, *Das Naturbild der heutigen Physik*.

³ HEISENBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 97. "Dieser Grundstoff Energie aber ist in verschiedenen Formen existenzfähig. Er tritt stets in diskreten Quanten auf, die wir als die kleinsten unteilbaren Bausteine alles Stofflichen ansehen und aus rein

of atomic physics will be "experimentally to trace and mathematically to formulate the laws of nature which determine all properties of the elementary particles and their relations." The great difficulty lies in the mathematical description of nature. "Basically we have not yet developed in the field of mathematics the tools with which we can properly grasp complicated events in the infinitely small." And yet, says HEISENBERG, it is conceivable that within the not too distant future we shall be able to investigate the properties of elementary particles and thus "the behaviour of matter."¹ This, then, was the opinion of a leading physicist who, moreover, made the following statement, which is extremely important to our study. As a result of the theory of relativity and the quantum theory uncertainties have arisen, but this does not mean that there is no longer any fixed course of events! "To the extent that the concepts of position, velocity, mass, etc., can be used without hesitation—and this is the case for instance in all experiences of daily life—to that extent the principles of Newton also hold good."²

The fact that in the microcosm there are indeterminable jumps has been, as already mentioned, the runway from which various scholars have taken off on far flights of fancy. We see this in KOHNSTAMM, who speaks of the "possibility of miracles." He says that the literature of Beth, Stange, Mandel, Traub and others is practically immaterial now, since it is based on the old assumptions. Things are different now, since modern science no longer believes in laws "which unambiguously determine for all times the course of the world. The 'possibility' of indeterminism, of bifurcation, in natural events must be admitted."³ It is, says KOHNSTAMM, precisely "impossible, in the present opinion, to fix any event, however simple it may be, in such a way that its past and future are as a result determined for as long as one wants." The simplest incident can in concreto end quite differently from what had been expected in abstracto. This is what KOHNSTAMM calls "the possibility of bi-

historischen Gründen nicht Atome, sondern Elementarteilchen nennen. Unter diesen Grundformen der Energie gibt es drei besonders stabile Arten: Elektronen, Protonen und Neutronen, aus denen die Materie im eigentlichen Sinne besteht, dazu stets die Bewegungsenergie. Dann gibt es jene Teilchen, die sich immer mit Lichtgeschwindigkeit bewegen und die Strahlung verkörpern, und schliesslich andere, kurzlebige Formen, von denen bisher erst einige wenige sicher festgestellt sind."

¹ HEISENBERG, op. cit., p. 97 f. Cf. VAN MELSEN, op. cit., pp. 183-191.

² HEISENBERG, op. cit., p. 38.

³ KOHNSTAMM, Schepper en Schepping, III, De Heilige, p. 101.

furcation," and then he arrives at the conclusion: "If we generalize our own experiences along the lines of 'admissibility in accordance with the known exact laws of nature,' then, as said, not a single story of the Bible—or of any other literature of antiquity—lies outside it. If we generalize in accordance with the principle that the world must formerly have run its course exactly as we now observe it, not in accordance with an exact description governed by laws, but in accordance with the rough and ready empiricism of our daily experience, then—needless to say—a very considerable part of the events related cannot be true, but are founded on suggestion and popular exaggeration. But it will be clear that this result contains no more than what we ourselves have put into it."¹ It therefore proves that KOHNSTAMM, with regard to the possibility of miracles, places a particular value on the course of development of our understanding of nature, as is illustrated by his following statement: "It will be clear that the disavowal of miracles as a general rule is a pure *petitio principii*. To postulate as self-evident that in the past the world must have proceeded on exactly the same objective course as nowadays is to deny a priori the possibility of 'special' revelation which always makes use of 'special' persons."² But it is *not* clear at all, since belief in miracles does not depend on the degree of scientific knowledge, but on belief in the Omnipotence of God! Is there anyone who assumes that the world in Jesus' day followed a different objective course from that today? And when KOHNSTAMM suddenly introduces the possibility of "special" revelation, does he not make a sudden mental leap from one field to another which is absolutely impossible? This mental leap is the consequence of trying to force a relation which simply does not exist and cannot exist. The "possibility" of miracles is just as problematic now as in the days of the triumphal progress of classical physics. For all the present-day talk of a certain freedom in the events of the microcosm—which we call "freedom" because the movements are immeasurable and perhaps will remain so, though that is still obscure—there is not a single reason for asserting that "quantum physics has made miracles possible," or that "a certain latitude" is left for miracles. The theologian NEUBERG, who mentions these statements, rightly urges reserve and caution and refuses "to base belief in miracles on this foundation and to cover religious certainty with a scientific

¹ KOHNSTAMM, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

² KOHNSTAMM, *op. cit.*, p. 104 ff.

cloak.”¹ He therefore condemns extreme judgments such as that of Eddington, who believes that nothing is left of the old system of causal laws and that we have not even found the framework for a new system. This creates confusion, says NEUBERG, and leads the layman to believe that science itself no longer believes in causality.² In the same spirit HARTMANN argues that the theologian must not lean on modern quantum physics in the sense of acausal physics, i.e. as if God were not “bound” to nature.³ HARTMANN stresses that Almighty God is a God of order and laws, in which His love and kindness find their finest expression. If God constantly worked miracles, that would be the greatest disaster for us men. Nature’s laws are the visible proof of His love.⁴ BALLAUFF also emphatically argues that science is neither a way to God nor on the way to God. This cannot be said too strongly, in the interests of both theology and science.⁵

¹ NEUBERG, op. cit., p. 277. According to H. Bergmann miracles have become possible through quantum physics. Mittasch says that there remains “ein gewisser Spielraum” for miracles.

² NEUBERG, op. cit., p. 99 . . . In succinct fashion HEYDE, *Entwertung der Kausalität?*, has brought the real issue to the fore. “Fragen wir, was denn genau genommen der neuerlichen in Naturwissenschaft und Philosophie der Gegenwart so aufsehen-erregenden Kausalitäts-Entwertung zugrunde liegt, dann lautet in aller Kürze die Antwort: der allerdings wohl überraschende Befund, dass gewisse subatomare Geschehnisse ohne ersichtliche Ursache auftreten . . . Das allein ist der ganze, schlichte Tatbestand—nichts weniger, aber auch nichts mehr—von dem aus man sich zu der wahrhaftig ungewöhnlichen Behauptung sog. ‘akausalen Geschehens’ berechtigt glaubte. Der folgenschwere Schritt von der verbürgten Tatsache zur kühnen Behauptung besteht also in einer unzulässigen Vertauschung: ein ‘nicht Feststellen, dass eine Ursache vorliegt,’ wird kurzerhand umgedeutet als ‘Feststellen, dass eine Ursache nicht vorliegt,’ gleich als ob es einwandfrei ersichtlich sei, dass jene mikrophysikalischen Geschehnisse geradezu akausal, d.h. ursachlos erfolgten! Die einfache Ergebnislosigkeit der Ursach-Forschung wird also bedenkenlos verwandelt in das vermeintliche Forschungs-Ergebnis der Ursachlosigkeit!” (p. 51). Heyde then asks: “Aber seit wann ist das Fehlen einer Erkenntnis dasselbe wie die Erkenntnis eines Fehlens . . . ?” and continues: “Nun, auf diese nur scheinbar rhetorische Frage gibt es allen Ernstes eine Antwort: ‘Seit den Tagen des Positivismus!’” Heyde devotes a considerable part of his work to a: “Beurteilung des Positivismus.”

³ HARTMANN, op. cit.: “Damit, dass man als letztes Atomgeschehen ein nichtkausalgebundenes, sondern gewissermassen frei schöpferisches Geschehen aufweist, glaubt man dem Gottesglauben die beste Stütze gegeben zu haben” (p. 18). But atomic physics goes on!

⁴ HARTMANN, op. cit., p. 22 ff.

⁵ BALLAUFF, *Das Problem des Lebendigen*, p. 11. Ballauff argues that one may not start from materialism, idealism, etc. “Alle Weltanschauung, alle weltanschaulichen Forderungen und Wünsche haben zu schweigen.” . . . Cf. also the study by DOLCH, *Theologie u. Physik*.

Whilst we therefore encounter proponents of these two views among the natural philosophers, they are also to be found among the theologians. According to JELKE there is always room for miracles, since our knowledge of the laws of nature is always relative.¹ OEPKE wants to keep our ideas on what is possible and impossible "elastic", having regard both to well-documented healing miracles and to the "latest research into the relativity of nature's laws."² Reference may also be made to what KORFF says in his observations on the resurrection of Jesus Christ. "Research into nature has for decennia already deemed itself absolutely incapable of giving a definite answer to the question of what is possible or impossible. Anyone still desirous of repudiating certain things must now do so entirely on his own responsibility. This is of great advantage to the clarity of the situation. The idea of the closed connection of nature and spiritual life is not the result of scientific research but, in the full sense of the words, a personal conviction." It is difficult to believe one's eyes when reading such a view, in which all knowledge is subjectified! And what are we to think of the alternative suggested: "either one believes in the closed connection of nature and spiritual life, or one believes in a God capable of giving life to the dead."³ As if the fact that uncertainties are encountered in the microcosm must necessarily lead to belief in the resurrection of Jesus Christ! It is not without reason that Heisenberg has warned against the drawing of precipitate conclusions and pointed to the laws governing everyday life. BRUNNER refers to Neuberger's thoughtful argumentation, and advises theologians to resist the temptation to rely too greatly on the latest developments in physics.⁴

Indeed, the development of physics, astronomy, chemistry and biology has so far provided not the slightest support for miracles. All sciences, both the exact ones and the intellectual ones (cf. psychology), are in motion, and they will continue to be in motion. Besides the "certainties" the "uncertainties" crop up. But empiricism tells us that events such as the immediate healing of serious diseases,

¹ JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 107.

² OEPKE, *TWNT*, III, p. 211. In a note Oepke says: "Es sei etwa an die Forschungen von August Mie und Werner Heisenberg erinnert." Such a scanty reference helps nobody.

³ KORFF, *Christologie*, II, p. 247 f.

⁴ BRUNNER, *Offenbarung u. Vernunft*, p. 292. GOEZ, *Naturwissenschaft u. Evangelium*; *Die Wunderfrage*, p. 147 ff. "Nicht die Naturwissenschaft, sondern der Glaube hat sich mit dem Wunder zu befassen" (p. 151).

the resurrection of the dead, the walking on the water, etc., form part of another order, an order which can be either believed or rejected.

This has now brought us to the shrewd question put by KAFKA. He says that the possibility of miracles reduces to this question: "whether there is the possibility of asserting with regard to some event or the other in the world of the senses that by its essence it can never be explained by means of the laws of nature."¹ All kinds of hypotheses can be thought up with regard to the origin of a miracle story and for instance one can rationalistically sift the account of the resurrection of Lazarus, but according to the account itself Lazarus actually died and was brought back to life again. Will it ever be possible to explain this by the "laws of nature"? That is to say, not to approach it hypothetically (there are suppositions enough!) but really to explain it scientifically? This can only be answered in the negative, and consequently here there is only room for the alternative: I believe it or I do not believe it. It is more or less immaterial how nature, both the macrocosm and the microcosm, will be further observed and described in its manifestations: there remains an empirical reality, a visible world, in which a series of static laws apply and in which man happens to lead a sensory life.

Reference should also be made to TENNANT's reasoning. "Laws, as known up to a certain hour, may perfectly well be broken; and a broken law is but an inadequate description. If an exception to a law turns up, whether it be the behaviour of radium or the resuscitation of the dead of life, we must, if we can, widen the law to include the abnormal case."² It will at once be clear that TENNANT is here comparing two dissimilar things. For, whatever the development of science may be, it is in any case out of the question that the laws of nature could ever be so "widened" that the resuscitation of the dead becomes a "natural" thing! TENNANT believes that the healing miracles of Jesus have already been explained by what happens through the medium of faith healers, etc., so that these are no longer miracles for us; the other miracles will also follow.³

¹ KAFKA, *Naturgesetz, Freiheit u. Wunder*, p. 102.

² TENNANT, *Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions*, p. 22.

³ TENNANT, *op. cit.*, p. 31. "Christianity does not presuppose the Christian miracles; they presuppose Christianity, though they are by no means bound up with Christianity. If signs and wonders actually occurred in connexion with its foundation, they are of little significance for theology in our time . . . Some gospel-miracles are already resolvable into naturally explicable phenomena, and others may yet be resolved" (p. 94).

The true state of affairs is, however, that nobody has yet succeeded in explaining the healing miracles of Jesus in a completely satisfactory "natural" way, let alone the nature miracles.

The statements in the Bible are quite positive. In certain circumstances God rendered empirical laws inoperative, in both animate and inanimate nature. Here we come to the question: what really happens to a law of nature rendered inoperative in this way? This can be expressed in various ways: one can speak of an interruption, discontinuation or disruption of that law; one can call it a departure, suspension or abolition, but fundamentally it amounts to exactly the same thing, viz. that a certain regularity is not in force for a period of varying length. Now the remarkable thing is that various scholars try to salvage the laws of nature as much as possible. For instance, PAUWELS says that miracles are no exceptions to the laws of nature, but "form cases in which the laws do not apply; they stand by the side of them."¹ NEUBERG regards miracles not as a disruption of the laws of nature, not as a breach in the causal whole; the laws of nature are instead led in a certain direction. When a flower is plucked, a chain of cause and effect is broken: "who will now claim that a higher than human power cannot break our causal chain, which we can grasp, and transfer it to a higher causal chain, which still lies within causal laws?"² It seems as if NEUBERG tries to salvage whatever can be salvaged, but he does not know what to do about the breach. Nor is BAVINCK prepared to accept an infringement of the law of nature. "The (miracle) is from God's side an act which is not directly caused by God any more than any ordinary event, and in the divine order and in the world idea it occupies just as well-ordered and harmonious a place as any natural

¹ PAUWELS, *Het Wonder*, p. 48. Cf. GUARDINI, *De Heer*, p. 172: it is not a question of "abolishing" natural law: "but this is at a given moment taken into the service of a higher completely real and significant power."

² NEUBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 279 ff. Cf. VAN MIERLO, *op. cit.*, p. 239: "Chaque fois qu'un être d'un monde supérieur intervient dans un monde inférieur, il produit un effet différent de celui qui serait obtenu par le seul jeu des lois du monde inférieur. Ces lois ne sont pas abolies ou modifiées, mais les phénomènes sont différents parce qu'il intervient un autre facteur." DOLCH, *Theologie u. Physik*, p. 100, note 49 . . . HEIM, *Zur Frage der Wunderheilungen*, p. 421, says that the healing miracles of Jesus do not consist in a breach of nature, but in a "binding of the strong," a victory over the "force of will" of the demons. "Die ganze Wundertätigkeit Jesu ruht also auf der Voraussetzung, dass die Welt eine Innenseite hat, die der Willenskraft zugänglich ist, und dass man mit dieser Innenwelt der Natur im Glauben ringen kann, wie man mit einer lebendigen Macht ringt."

phenomenon. In miracles God merely brings into operation a special force which, just like any other force, works in accordance with its own nature and laws and therefore also results in its own product."¹ We must, however, note that arguments such as these are inspired by theological views and not by empirical reality. Divine order is recognized in the order and regularity, and both in these and in miracles revelation of the omnipotence of the Creator and Sustainer is seen. Theologically speaking, there is no objection to this. But if one reasons from empiricism, the situation changes and miracles definitely do not occupy "just as well-ordered and harmonious a place as any natural phenomenon," as BAVINCK puts it. For, however the facts are twisted and turned, in miracles an event "*contra naturam*" takes place, in which the regularity of the events of nature is disturbed. For this reason NEUBERG's view is also incorrect. For instance,

¹ BAVINCK, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek*, II, p. 658. Cf. LEWIS, *Miracles*. Lewis believes it "inaccurate to define a miracle as something that breaks the laws of nature. It doesn't . . . The divine art of miracle is not an art of suspending the pattern to which events conform but of feeding new events into that pattern" (p. 72) . . . BERKOUWER, *De Voorzienigheid Gods*, p. 237 ff. Berkouwer recalls A. Kuyper's view, which corresponds to that of Bavinck. Kuyper is opposed to supranaturalism, and his opposition "is the product of the religious protest against a nature independent of God which would in that case be breached in miracles." According to Kuyper a miracle can and may "never be represented as a disturbance or intervention; all that happens is that at a given moment God wants a certain thing otherwise than he had wanted it up to then" (*E Voto*, I, p. 240). A miracle is "exactly the same as a normal natural effect, for it is both that a command went forth from the lips of the Lord and that His servants, who are formed here by the elements and the forces of nature, performed it as He asked" (*E Voto*, I, p. 241). For God, therefore, miracles do not exist. "All that is marvellous lies only in our consciousness and in our eye" (*E Voto* I, p. 240). Kuyper therefore does not see miracles at the level of the "*contra naturam*." Berkouwer follows him in this. "It is not true that in miracles a 'greater' power is manifest than in the ordinary course of events . . . But in miracles God goes a way in which He acts otherwise than in the ordinary course of events" (p. 258 f.). Cf. HOOYKAAS, *Natural Law and Divine Miracle*, p. 206: "In the Bible a miracle is not considered as an *intervention* in a world that otherwise runs its own course; rule and exception to the rule are equally wonderful to religious contemplation. God's activity is behind *every* thing, however unimportant it may seem." Cf. p. 212: "Whether God manifests Himself in the order or in the 'miracles' of nature does not make any essential difference from the biblical point of view because His omnipotence is equally recognized in both." See also p. 217 f. . . . Opposition to making the order of nature absolute is justified, but it in no way alters the fact that miracles appear to us as events "*contra naturam*." There is not a single dogmatic view which can reduce or eliminate this given fact. A miracle is therefore not "exactly the same as a normal natural effect," as Kuypers sees it, even though both natural order and miracle are brought about by one and the same Power of God. Cf. BARTH, *K.D.* II, 1, p. 608.

when Jesus walked on the Sea of Galilee, the laws of nature were not led in another direction but interrupted. The sudden recovery from leprosy meant a breach in the course of the disease, which should have proceeded in accordance with certain rules. It may be countered that these events did not occur at random, but with a salutary intention. We agree at once, but this purpose does not alter the fact of the interruption. The essential thing is to separate and distinguish things as clearly as possible. From the point of view of Biblical theology it can be said that Jesus' healings were directed not "*contra naturam*" but *contra Satan*, that Jesus revealed His powers against the Devil and not against nature, but it must once again be explicitly pointed out that this does not detract from the fact that something happened "*contra naturam*!"

Hence we also object to TENNANT's observations on nature. He states that nature is both *naturans* and *naturata*. Nature has a static and a dynamic character. Nature can be moulded by internal spontaneity and also by outside forces. "A priori there is room for supplementary creative acts, for miracle, and also for providential guidance of the already created. There is a relatively settled, stereotyped order characterized by routine and regularity." In this routine the *mirabile*, the wonderful, occurs; a *miraculum* is produced by "supernatural causation," it is "activity on the part of the Creator."¹ Our objection is to TENNANT's theory that there is "room for supplementary creative acts," on which he bases an immanent possibility of miracles and thus attempts to justify miracles by *rationation*. We encounter the same idea in CAIRNS, who says that the acceptance of a "closed nature" excludes miracles. But "revelation" sees matters differently; "it invariably regards nature as a plastic medium, through which God works out His purposes in the lives of free human spirits."² Here again properties are attributed to nature which as it were must open the way for the possibility of miracles. It is not clear to us what exactly is meant by the expression "plastic medium." If it is really desired to do justice to the concept of miracle as the impossible happening (*Mensching*),³ then any attempt to use one or the other study of nature as the foundation of this concept must

¹ TENNANT, *op. cit.*, p. 41 ff.

² CAIRNS, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

³ MENSCHING, *Das Wunder im Glauben u. Aberglauben der Völker*, p. 9: "Wunder ist das Ereigniswerden des Unmöglichen." See Section IA, Miracles as Religious Phenomena.

be abandoned, and expressions such as "elasticity," "plastic medium," etc., must be avoided since their vagueness obscures the heart of the issue.

When, as by TITIUS, "will" is placed alongside the laws of nature, so as to defend the possibility of miracles, the discussion moves to a different plane, that of the mind, and theological, philosophical and psychological considerations come into play. TITIUS argues that both law and will are indispensable: "consequently belief in miracles is also indispensable as the form of thought in which we depict God's freedom of action."¹ However, the introduction of the concept of will does not present any essentially new prospects. TITIUS deduces from the indispensable nature of law and will that both have equal force and value in the same field. Here lies the mistake; the issue is not the "indispensability" but the fields in which law and will apply and are used. One can never distill the possibility of miracles from the indispensability of the will as a function of spiritual life.

Now, does it follow from the fact that neither the conception of law nor that of will opens up any access to miracles that nothing can be said about the relation between faith and science or about that between miracles and natural science? The answer is yes and no. No, because science's subject of study is nature in all its aspects, but nature pure and simple, without the interposition of any outlook on life.² There is neither a Christian nor a Mohammedan physics; but there are Christian and Mohammedan physicists. And for that reason the answer is also yes. For there are many believing physicists who, struck by their own discoveries or those of others, have made pronouncements not only on the interrelation of things observed by man, but also on the relation of things to God. Remember Kepler's moving prayer: "I thank you, my Creator and my Lord, for having given me such great joy in your creation, such delight at the works

¹ TITIUS, *Natur u. Gott*. "Auch sei hervorgehoben, dass man dem Wunderproblem nur dann gerecht werden kann, wenn man es auf psychologischen Boden stellt, nicht aber auf metaphysischen" (p. 780) . . . Titius calls the disavowal of miracles damage to religious experience in its depth, its paradox, its mystery. A God who were to be curbed in His work by inert, indolent matter would be no God, says Titius (p. 781).

² Cf. NEUBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 259. Neuberg supports a: "religiöse Neutralisierung der Wissenschaft." TITIUS, *op. cit.*, p. 592: "Die heutige Forschung schliesst mit allen andern metaphysischen Voraussetzungen auch den Gottesgedanken aus und muss ihn ausschliessen, um unbeirrt ihrer Aufgabe, die Beziehungen der Naturdinge zu einander zu erforschen, nachzugehen."

of your hands. I have been permitted to make the glory of your works known to man, at least as far as my finite spirit was able to grasp your infinity. If I have taught mankind things that were unworthy of your greatness, or if I have pursued my own honour, forgive me in your divine grace.”¹ Pasteur said: “Precisely because I have reflected, I have remained a believer,” and G. Mie tells us: “A thinking naturalist is necessarily a pious man.”² However, it should always be remembered that such testimony, important in itself, does not possess the slightest strictly scientific value, and its use can at most have a certain apologetic value in preaching.

PLANCK has argued that religion and science are not in conflict with one another. We agree with him on this point, but we do not consider his argumentation correct. PLANCK namely asserts that both religion and science agree that “firstly a rational world order independent of man exists, and that secondly the essence of this world order is never directly identifiable, but can only be indirectly understood or surmised. Religion uses for this its special symbols, and exact science its measurements, which are based on sensory perception. Consequently nothing stands in our way, and our thirst for knowledge, which longs for an undivided outlook on the world, demands that the two omnipresent and yet mysterious Forces, the world order of science and the God of religion, be identified with one another.” PLANCK goes on to say that the fundamental difference in the methods of understanding should be borne in mind: for faith God is at the beginning of the study, and for science He is at the end. “Thus, wherever and how far we look, we never find any contradiction between religion and science, but full agreement on the vital points.”³ Here Planck has done measurements with his mental processes which simply cannot be done! The identification as seen by Planck derogates from God’s Being as the Being of the

¹ See DOKTER, op. cit., p. 24.

² NEUBERG, op. cit., p. 257 . . . VAN MIERLO, op. cit., p. 177, lists in the chapter on “L’Ordre et la Finalité” a whole series of names. “Des hommes comme Fénélon, Buffon, Linné, Cuvier, Faraday, Dumas, Wurtz, Pasteur, Fabre, Lord Kelvin, Lord Rayleigh, Termier et tant d’autres, ont proclamé que cet ordre dans la nature témoignait de l’existence de Dieu.” Van Mierlo refers to D. Vernet, *Le Témoignage des Savants*, 1941, and *Gottes Zeugen* by Zöckler . . . Cf. PLANCK, *Religion u. Naturwissenschaft*, p. 31. As regards the religious and philosophical views held by a number of leading contemporary scholars in the scientific field, see DENNERT, *Die Natur das Wunder Gottes*. See also VON WEIZSÄCKER, *Atomenergie u. Atomzeitalter*, *Zwölfte Vorlesung: Wie können wir im Atomzeitalter leben?*, p. 155 ff.

³ PLANCK, op. cit., p. 28 ff.

"wholly other," the Creator of heaven and earth. The view that for science God is at the end of the study presupposes a progression from knowledge of the world to knowledge of God, and in this way denies the essential nature of the Christian religion, viz. its character of revelation.

It is often said that modern physics has become cautious and unpretentious, and is no longer an "enemy" of theology.¹ This view is as such open to challenge. Apart from the fact that all true sciences bear the characteristics of unpretentiousness and caution, or at least ought to, this may not be interpreted for physics as a point in favour of miracles. Science as such has never been an "enemy" of God. Opposition arises only in cases where the investigator loses himself in speculations of natural philosophy which defame God's word and works. It is pleasant when one can note that the various sciences respect one another. ASCHOFF says that science and theology "have each increasingly recognized the necessity and independence of the other form of study. The precise knowledge of the limits to our understanding of nature also makes us natural scientists modest

¹ NEUBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 267: "Sehe ich auch die Naturwissenschaft nicht 'auf dem Wege zur Religion', wie der Titel einer Schrift von Bavink lautet, den ich nicht billigen kann, so sehe ich sie doch nicht mehr als Feindin der Religion." See WENZL, *op. cit.*, p. 135 ff., regarding the misunderstanding caused by the title of the book by Bernhard Bavink, and Bavink's intention . . . See also BAVINK, *Das Weltbild der heutigen Naturwissenschaften u. seine Beziehungen zu Philosophie und Religion*, p. 159 . . . MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*: "The assumption of a hard-and-fast mechanistic theory of the universe has today lost its infallibility even for the scientific mind. Even what are known as 'miracles' are no longer treated with a contemptuous wave of the scientific hand. Nature itself is the standing miracle" (p. 350) . . . How greatly opinions can differ about the relation between the natural sciences and natural philosophy is evident from what BETH, *Natuurphilosophie*, Ch. III, *De taak ener moderne natuurphilosophie*, pp. 55-61, says. After having drawn attention briefly to the views of leading writers on natural philosophy, he gives his own views with regard to the task of natural philosophy, which he sees in particular as the syntactical and semantic analysis of scientific theories. What interests us is his opinion that this philosophy must be independent of *Weltanschauungen* and outlooks on life. "Anyone who sees the element of *Weltanschauung* or outlook on life precisely as the really philosophical one will not regard this as a step forward. But those who, like myself, wish to see natural philosophy practised as a science and, like myself, are convinced that science cannot tolerate any influences from outlooks on life or *Weltanschauungen*, will think differently about it" (p. 61). Here a tremendous problem is broached. We are of the opinion that natural philosophy wants and aims at more than rational reflections on techniques of calculation and rules, methods and concepts, however vital this may be considered in itself. Yet it can form a valuable deterrent to bold flights of fancy or cosmological and mythological meditations.

with regard to the truth obtained by religious knowledge, to the religious conception of the world.”¹

We ourselves should like to indicate the following guiding principles. There is a difference between “explaining” nature and “understanding” it. In explanation in the sense of observation and formulation only the inventive and intellectual capacities of the investigator are in function; in understanding nature his whole existence is involved. “Understanding” is all-embracing, it is teleologically directed, it seeks the last grounds and values. Explanation operates with “the determining element;” understanding asks whether there is “a determining element” behind things. Understanding and explaining are most intimately interrelated; but in the case of the one person they will both remain anchored in the order of nature,

¹ ASCHOFF, *Über die Stellung der Naturwissenschaften zur Religion*, pp. 116 and 127. (Aschoff is Evangelisch; he is a professor of medicine and a physicist) . . . DIJKSTERHUIS, *Christendom en Natuurwetenschap*, p. 340 f., remarks that scientists are much more careful than before in making a distinction between the scientific results that they achieve and the consequences which may or may not be attached to these results from the philosophical point of view. Dijksterhuis describes the modern naturalist as “extremely modest.” And, according to him, in our days theology hardly has any further inclination to tutor science. TITUS, *op. cit.*: “Religion und Naturwissenschaft in Harmonie mit einander zu bringen, wird ein jeder wünschen, dem ein umfassendes und tiefes Bildungsideal vorschwebt” (p. 1). Cf. also BAVINCK, *Ger. Dogmatiek*, I, p. 384 ff. . . . DOKTER, *op. cit.*, p. 34 ff., devotes a chapter to “Natuurwetenschap en Theologie” (Science and Theology), in which he advises theology to guard against trying to make “apologetic” profit from the changes in science. Dokter points to the discussion between the Church (Dr. Howe, the physicist and theologian, plays an important part in this) and physics; at the same time he points to Howe’s opinion of a certain analogy between the dogmatic work of Karl Barth and scientific research. “The theologian and the physicist allow the rationalistically constructed system to be breached by the foreign structure of the phenomenon that presents itself. The theologian cannot imagine the reality of salvation which is revealed in the Word; and the physicist cannot imagine the reality which he symbolizes in his formulas.” . . . This view doubtless has its fascination, but it must be borne in mind that this is nothing more than a formal analogy. For the “foreign structure” of revelation is of an entirely different order from that of physics. The “strange structure” with which physics is concerned is and remains a structure of this world of creation; it remains immanent! . . . VAN MELSEN, in an important chapter, “Natuurwetenschap, Wijsbegeerte en Natuurphilosophie,” (*op. cit.*, pp. 192-215), defends the right to existence of philosophy as a science *sui generis*. “A place will always be reserved for it” alongside science (p. 215). Van Melsen gives a realistic philosophy “more chance of making a contribution to the philosophical background of science than another; in other words Democritus or Aristotle seems to us to have more chance than Kant or Hume” (p. 215). This cautiously worded pronouncement, however, reflects the religious and philosophical insight of the Roman Catholic author.

so that the last ground will also be sought in nature ; in the case of another person understanding will spring from the order of faith, or be of a reflective nature.

Let us bear in mind the distinction between explaining and understanding for a moment, and return to the beginning of this chapter, in which we mentioned BULTMANN's view of the changed cosmology. In BULTMANN explaining and understanding are closely interwoven. He wants to do both: to understand the New Testament and explain it. He wants to understand it as God's decisive message to the world,¹ but he can only explain and understand from the structure of modern man.² This man, who can regard himself both as nature and as spirit, has been scientifically educated, but at the same time he is man in his own right, he is man with his own self-understanding. He is dependent on nature, which he nevertheless dominates.³ It is this self-understanding, in which the new development of science also has a say, it is *this* mentality of modern man which has become a criterion in understanding and explaining the New Testament.⁴ This is subjectivism, and STAUFFER has castigated it.⁵ Now this modern man, says BULTMANN, feels uncomfortable about the mythological cloak in which the message of the New Testament is wrapped, and cannot accept it; this cloak must therefore be "stripped off."⁶ BULTMANN has undertaken this task, and has acquitted

¹ BULTMANN in *Kerygma u. Mythos*, I: "Denn das Heilsgeschehen, von dem wir reden, ist nicht ein mirakelhaftes, supranatürliches Geschehen, sondern es ist geschichtliches Geschehen in Raum und Zeit" (p. 48).

² BULTMANN, K. u. M., I: "Es handelt sich aber gar nicht nur um die Kritik, die vom naturwissenschaftlichen Weltbild ausgeht, sondern ebenso sehr, ja im Grunde noch vielmehr um die Kritik, die aus dem Selbstverständnis des modernen Menschen erwächst" (p. 18).

³ BULTMANN, K. u. M., I: "In jedem Falle versteht er sich als ein einheitliches Wesen, das sich selbst sein Empfinden, sein Denken und Wollen zuschreibt. Er versteht sich nicht so eigentümlich geteilt wie das Neue Testament den Menschen sieht, so dass fremde Mächte in sein inneres Leben eingreifen könnten. Er schreibt sich die innere Einheit seiner Zustände und Handlungen zu und nennt einen Menschen, der diese Einheit durch den Eingriff dämonischer oder göttlicher Mächte gespalten wähnt, schizophran" (p. 19).

⁴ Cf. DE VOS, *Nieuwe Testament en Mythe*, p. 52 ff.

⁵ E. STAUFFER, K. u. M., II, p. 19: "Man kann Bultmanns Thesen philosophiegeschichtlich kritisieren. Einst hat der grosse Protagoras die Maxime aufgestellt: Der Mensch ist das Mass aller Dinge. Bultmann hat diese Maxime übernommen, aber nicht nur kritiklos rezipiert, sondern zugleich vulgarisiert und dadurch selber ad absurdum geführt. Denn seine Maxime lautet: Der moderne Mensch ist das Mass aller Dinge, das Mass auch dessen, was im Neuen Testament Geltung haben soll."

⁶ See BULTMANN, K. u. M., I, p. 48.

himself of it in a very radical manner. But at a given moment he stops—it is definitely unfair to Bultmann to assert that he reduces the New Testament to nothing—and he is then left with a “picture of Jesus” which he considers comprehensible, normative and redemptive from the point of view of the existence and position of his own modern humanity. ¹ He retains a “Christ” in whom he perceives God’s liberation of man. ²

We have already mentioned Bultmann’s view of miracles; in one way or the other they are explained away en masse. ³ There are already followers of Bultmann who would like to see the accounts of miracles deleted from the pericopes! ⁴

BULTMANN has, in his way, made a contribution to the discussion between faith and science, between miracles and the natural sciences. “One cannot use electric light and the radio, or in cases of illness call in the aid of modern medical and clinical methods, and at the same time believe in the world of spirits and miracles of the New Testament. And anyone who believes that he himself is capable of doing so must clearly realize that, when he explains this as the attitude of Christian faith, he makes the teachings of Christianity incomprehensible

¹ BULTMANN, K. u. M., I, p. 48: “Wir haben versucht, die Entmythologisierung der neutestamentlichen Verkündigung durchzuführen. Blieb ein mythologischer Rest? Wer es schon Mythologie nennt, wenn von Gottes Tun, von seinem entscheidenden eschatologischen Tun, die Rede ist, für den gewiss. Aber jedenfalls ist dann solche Mythologie nicht mehr Mythologie im alten Sinne, die mit dem Untergang des mythischen Weltbildes versunken wäre. Denn das Heilsgeschehen, von dem wir reden, ist nicht ein mirakelhaftes, supranaturales Geschehen, sondern es ist geschichtliches Geschehen in Raum und Zeit.” Bultmann believes that he is following the intention of the N.T. and doing full justice to the paradox of the New Testament proclamation by the proposition: “dass Gottes eschatologischer Gesandter ein konkreter historischer Mensch ist, dass Gottes eschatologisches Handeln sich in einem Menschenschicksal vollzieht, dass es also ein Geschehen ist, das sich als eschatologisches nicht weltlich ausweisen kann.”

² BULTMANN, K. u. M., I, p. 39: “Das in Christus sich ereignende Geschehen ist also die Offenbarung der Liebe Gottes, die den Menschen von sich selbst befreit zu sich selbst, indem sie ihn zu einem Leben der Hingabe im Glauben und in der Liebe befreit.” Cf. K. u. M., II, p. 196 ff., in which Bultmann further explains what he means by the action of God.

³ See Section Ic, Aspects of the Struggle to Define and Explain Miracles.

⁴ E. STAUFFER, K. u. M., II: “Man kann Bultmanns Thesen kirchlich bewerten und einmal davon sprechen, wie das Entmythologisierungsprogramm sich in der homiletischen und katechetischen Praxis auswirkt. Schon hört man im Kreise der jungen Bultmanntheologen z.B. die Forderung, dass alle Wundergeschichten und sonstigen Mythentexte aus der Perikopenreihe verschwinden sollen. Der Gottesdienst soll ‘entkultet’ werden, die ‘sture Verteidigung des leeren Grabes’ soll eingestellt werden . . .” (p. 19).

to and impossible for our present day." It must be realized in which cosmology man actually lives. "Now this is determined by science, and dominates man through the schools, the press, the radio, the cinema and, above all, through technology."¹ In this sketch of the situation as he sees it, BULTMANN indubitably gives a striking description of modern man's way of life, but firstly we wonder whether Bultmann's interpretation of the New Testament is itself comprehensible to and possible for modern man, and secondly we would point out that, if Christian teaching were to be stripped of its "impossibility" and "incomprehensibility" in Bultmann's sense, it would be robbed of its nature of revelation, of Miracle.

However, we are concerned with the problem of miracles and not the Bultmann problem in all its magnitude; there is in any case a still-growing stream of literature on that subject.

We now arrive at a summary of the above.

In Antiquity nature was in reality no more "perforated" (*durchlöchert*) than it is today, but it *was* in the ancient world of thought. Good and evil supernatural forces were considered capable of intervention both in natural events and in man's personal life. When scientific understanding grew, when all kinds of "laws" were discovered and when the cosmology changed, a turning-point occurred in the world of ideas, in a struggle between ecclesiastical tradition and scientific progress, and one "opening" after the other was closed. The laws of classical physics, in which the natural order was laid down mathematically and mechanically, seemed unbreakable and eternal. During the heyday of materialism, plus atheism, the cosmology was declared closed for ever: there was no room left for God and miracles. However, a series of discoveries demolished this system and a "new" physics entered on the scene. As a result of this, many believe, a new possibility of miracles is offered in surprising fashion. Gone was the sovereign authority of iron causality! Must one not submit to the corpuscular and undulatory interpretations, each as a facet of known reality, to the fact that an object is only recognizable

¹ BULTMANN, K. u. M., I, p. 18, and note 1 on p. 18 . . . Cf. BULTMANN, *Glauben u. Verstehen*, I, p. 214: "Der Gedanke des Wunders als Mirakel ist für uns heute unmöglich geworden, weil wir das Naturgeschehen als gesetzmässiges Geschehen verstehen, also das Wunder als eine Durchbrechung des gesetzmässigen Zusammenhanges des Naturgeschehens; und dieser Gedanke ist uns heute nicht mehr vollziehbar." The idea of the interrelationship is: "mit unserem Dasein in der Welt gegeben" (p. 215).

up to a certain limit? ¹ Was not the concept "causality" therefore undergoing a crisis? There was now "latitude" for miracles! But Heisenberg has pointed out that a fixed validity remains in all experiences of daily life. And BULTMANN has rightly said that it is naive to appeal to the indeterminism of causality as a defence of belief in miracles. ²

Despite the fact that the whole of modern science is on the move and old "certainties" are tottering, not a single way has yet been found along which miracles could be approached scientifically. And that way will never be found, neither from the point of view of Biblical theology nor from that of our empirical knowledge. For God is a God of law and regularity, who has made His order of Creation run along fixed lines. And therefore the principle of causality is not a concealed enemy of God, but a revelation of His power and will, of His love and kindness (Max Hartmann). ³ It is *man* who can elevate this natural order to the highest order, who can

¹ LAMBERECHTS, op. cit.: "Both of them, the corpuscular and the wave theory, contain elements of truth. Light and matter are not waves, nor are they particles. They behave as if they are particles every time that energy and impulse are exchanged. However, these particles lack something essential, which makes it impossible to treat them as real particles: we know neither their given place nor the path they follow. They move in a bewitched world 'as if' they are waves. The question: what, then, *is* light? is more difficult to answer than ever before, despite our extensive mastery of mathematics" (p. 117) . . . "Particle and wave are for us only facets of the reality which remains hidden to us" (p. 130).

² BULTMANN, K. u. M., II, p. 181: "Es tut auch gar nichts zur Sache, wenn man darauf hinweist, dass das Weltbild der Naturwissenschaft von heute nicht mehr das des 19. Jahrhunderts ist: und es ist naiv, die Tatsache der Relativierung des Kausalgesetzes hinsichtlich der atomaren Vorgänge zur Repristinierung des mythischen Wunderglaubens benützen zu wollen, als ob mit dieser Relativierung das Tor für das Eingreifen jenseitiger Mächte geöffnet worden wäre! Verzichtet etwa die Naturwissenschaft heute auf das Experiment?" . . . BERKOUWER, *De Voorzienigheid Gods*, p. 246 f., elucidates the matter from a different angle. Anyone who thinks that there is again "scope" for the action of God "has by so thinking already rendered this action relative and restricted, and has contrasted it with the order of nature as an independent reality" (p. 246). Anyone who associates the intellectual possibility of miracles with "hiatuses" in the results of science must indeed await science's development "with fear and trembling" (p. 247).

³ Cf. NEUBERG, op. cit.: "Sprechen wir also nicht von einer Krisis der Kausalität, sondern nur von einer Krisis der Kausalauffassung. Die Wissenschaft jedenfalls würde ihren Boden verlieren, wenn sie ohne Überzeugung von Kausalzusammenhang arbeiten sollte . . . Wer kausal denkt, denkt in der Richtung Gottes. Gottes Kausalreihen können sich ändern, auch überlagern, ja durchkreuzt werden, aber soweit und solange er will, bleiben sie in Ordnung und Geltung, gefriert das Wasser bei 0 Grad; öffnet sich die Knospe dem Licht; gebiert ein Tier, wenn es empfangen hat" (p. 102 f.).

make it absolute and deify it and can thus place it as an independent quantity "opposite" its Creator. Once the natural order is proclaimed as highest order, there is no room for miracles. Science, physics, physics pure and simple, can never arrive at this judgment. For it is science's task to find the most natural possible explanation for all phenomena. It cannot and may not make allowance for miracles, since it would then cease to be "science!" But it is at the same time "only" science! Even though the scientist will never be able to "explain" miracles, it will be possible for him to "understand" miracles. This understanding is an understanding of faith, which does not regard nature as something outside God, or as a part of God, but as a creation of God, over which He, as Maker, is therefore also Lord, over which He rules and upon which He can therefore "encroach."

Although it is beyond the scope of our study to draw attention to reflections in which the element of testimony prevails, we feel that a striking conclusion to this chapter is offered by the words of GUARDINI: "With regard to Christ the conversion of our thought is required. Not only the conversion of our will and our deeds, but also that of our thought. This, however, consists no longer in meditating on Christ from the world, but in accepting Christ as the criterion of what is actual and possible and judging the world from Him."¹

As long as man judges miracles on the basis of his knowledge of the world, they will remain an enigma to him. When he judges the world from Christ, that is to say allows his final opinion to be

¹ GUARDINI, *De Heer*, p. 892 f. . . . See also VAN DE HULST and VAN PEURSEN, *Phaenomenologie en Natuurwetenschap*, p. 130 ff., the chapter entitled: "De wetenschapsmens en het dagelijks wereldbeeld." In this chapter the following appears: "Science needs leadership. This sentence, taken from a lucid article by Karl Jaspers ('Sinn und Wesen der Wissenschaft,' *Eltheto*, Jan. 1938), says all that needs to be said." This leadership may be "external" and "internal;" Jaspers means "internal leadership" (p. 153). One can speak of leadership "because the totality of human existence must guide the course of science . . . In its structure science points beyond the narrower bounds of its activity to the much wider, existential sphere of man in his totality" (p. 158). This leadership is not achieved: "by merely making use of rational knowledge or irrational emotions or poetic intuition. It is manifested only by man in all his facets. The Humanist will hear this leadership in the voice of his conscience and in comprehensive reflections on human dignity. The Christian will see in the meaning and the progress of himself and science decisions transcending man and cosmos, so that he will speak of God's leadership, which redeems the directed course of his life." Genuine science liberates; it completes and flings open; it knows that it is surrounded "by ever-new horizons" (p. 160 f.).

guided by His Word and Spirit so as to “understand” things, a “miracle” occurs in his mind; rejection is transformed into approval and the revelation of God is recognized in the “naturally” impossible and offending.

III MIRACLES AND MEDICINE

(a) *Tension and conflict between theology and medicine*

In the first place we should like to recall here what we said at the beginning of the preceding chapter about the drawbacks and dangers of venturing outside one's own field. But a chapter such as this may not be omitted from a study of Jesus' miracles. In the course of the centuries many a man of medicine has reflected on the nature of the diseases and the healings recounted in the Old and the New Testament, and the theologian may not ignore these medical voices, even though he will consider various explanations to be in conflict with the message of the Bible, or at least in conflict with his theological views. Although it is not possible for doctors and theologians to follow each other in technical details, which naturally demand well-founded and often specialized knowledge, there is still a sufficiently large meeting ground left. Both the scientific and the practical common territory of doctors and theologians is by no means the smallest area in the whole of the sciences. Furthermore, the common descent of ministers of religion and doctors from the priesthood—the combined office is still encountered today among primitive peoples—may never be forgotten.

At a very early date medicine was already trying to place itself on a rational basis. The publications of Egyptian papyri describing medicine in the Egypt of ca. 1900—1250 B.C. reveal how, side by side with a remarkably advanced medical knowledge and surgical skill (operations, dental fillings; mention is even made of an inhaler), incantations and magic spells played a great part in the combating of disease. Sometimes the offices of high priest, high court physician and high wizard were combined in one person!¹ In Greece, in about the fifth century before Christ, religion and medicine were separated; although the practice of medicine remained free, it was not long before a man wishing to set up as a recognized physician at for instance Athens had to declare where and how he had been trained. The oath which the pupils of the school of Hippocrates had to take

¹ See SIGERIST, *A History of Medicine*, III, Ancient Egypt, p. 217 ff.; LINDEBOOM, *Geschiedenis der Geneeskunde*, p. 28 ff.; OEPKE, *TWNT*, III, p. 195; textual material is offered by ELAUT, *Antieke Geneeskunde*; TROELS LUND, *Gesundheit u. Krankheit*, p. 10.

is evidence of a high ethical conception of the profession of physician. However, religious ideas and magical practices constantly hampered a purely scientific development of medicine, and in the days in which Jesus lived we find throughout the Roman Empire belief in gods who could cure man of all kinds of ills. Aristides, who lived in the second century after Christ, gives the following list of healing gods: Serapis, Isis, Zeus, Athene, Heracles, the Asclepiads with Hygieia, Iaso, Panacea, Aegle, Epione, Telesphorus, Dionysus, Apollo, Artemis, Amphiaraus, Trophonius, the Nymphs, Poseidon.¹ Now this belief and the magical practices originated in the view that diseases did not have natural causes but were brought about by supernatural powers.

Hippocrates of Cos (ca. 460—377 B.C.), the father of Greek medical science, tried to free disease from the supernatural and mysterious atmosphere surrounding it. In his work "The Sacred Disease" he says that epilepsy is not a form of demoniac possession, but a disease of the brain, which can be cured by physicians: "without purifications and magic." There is thus no "sacred" element in epilepsy. Opinions are divided on whether the school of Hippocrates completely excluded "the divine," the "miracle" from medicine. HERZOG, for instance, does not see in Hippocrates' writings any opposition to the divine as a "power" in healing, any attack on the "kirchliche Heiltätigkeit," but instead an attack on those who were hated both by science and by the Church, viz. the wizards and magicians; a view which, according to HERZOG, we encounter throughout the ages.² We shall not go further into this point; one thing that is certain is that the school of Hippocrates moved solely along rational lines. "The extent to which the Hippocratici had advanced in their rational views is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that they made a point of treating mental disturbances just like other diseases, principally by diet and gymnastics," says HEIBERG.³

¹ DE LEEUW, Aelius Aristides, p. 80.

² HERZOG, Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros, p. 149 ff.; cf. OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 197 f.

³ HEIBERG, Naturwissenschaften u. Mathematik im klass. Altertum, p. 16. NESTLE, Vom Mythos zum Logos, gives a clear survey of the Hippocratic literature, p. 207 ff. Nestle gives the following important quotation from Hippocrates' work "The Sacred Disease" (Περὶ ἱερῆς νόσου): "Mit der sog. heiligen Krankheit verhält es sich folgendermassen: sie scheint mir um nichts göttlicher oder heiliger zu sein als die andern Krankheiten, sondern sie hat, wie die andern Krankheiten auch, eine natürliche Ursache (φύσιν καὶ πρόφασιν), aus der sie entsteht; nur die Menschen hielten sie für einen göttlichen Vorgang, da s e ihr

The belief that gods influence the course of a disease and can effect a cure by a miracle is to be found among various great physicians of the ancient world, especially after the first century A.D., when scientifically founded medical practice was followed by a period of religious revival but at the same time of widespread superstition.¹ A typical example is formed by the striking figure of Galen (129-199 A.D.), a physician from Pergamum who, apart from a short interruption, had a brilliant medical career in Rome from 162 to his death. He has a large number of writings to his name. Galen was a great worshipper of the god Aesculapius, who, he claimed, had cured him of a dangerous abscess and had given him all kinds of advice on the treatment of disease.² This Galen, whose influence was very great until far into the Middle Ages, used as one of his means for curing injuries, festering wounds and inflammations *terra sigillata*, a medicinal red clay compressed into round cakes and stamped with the image of the goddess Diana. This clay, which came from the island of Lemnos, was known throughout the classical world.³ From accounts given by Galen, and also those of Aristides and Rufus, two contemporaries of Galen, we know that in the second century after Christ the temple of Aesculapius at Pergamum and medicine on a scientific basis were in very close relation to each other.⁴ Reference must be made to a particular fact to which VON HARNACK draws attention. Galen was a much loved figure among the Roman Christians. He was the first Greek to speak appreciatively of the Christians, "and ecclesiastical history will always honour the fact that it was a physician who was the first man in literature to oppose the evil calumnies addressed to the Christians."⁵

ratlos gegenüberstanden und sich darüber verwunderten, weil sie den andern Krankheiten nicht gleicht" (p. 226). BAUMANN, *Psyche's lijden*, pp. 228-241, praises the Hippocratici because of their superior and beneficial therapy.

¹ OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 196.

² HEIBERG, *op. cit.*, p. 94; WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. 77.

³ VAN ANDEL, *Klassieke wondermiddelen*, p. 170.

⁴ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 145 ff. Galen even urged his patients to have more confidence in the dreams and revelations of Aesculapius than in his medical opinions, see DE LEEUW, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

⁵ VON HARNACK, *Medizinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte*, p. 42. Cf. WALZER, Galen on Jews and Christians. As far as Walzer knows, Galen is "the first pagan author who implicitly places Greek philosophy and the Christian religion on the same footing" (p. 43). Galen is tolerant, p. 44; cf. p. 63 f. . . . "Galen is the first Greek philosopher in Rome who, without becoming a Christian himself, gave a fair and sympathetic appreciation of the Christians for philosophical reasons" (p. 69). Walzer gives extensive textual material; cf. his discussion of

In such a world, in which rational medicine went hand in hand with all kinds of practices of superstition, magic, astrology, and so on, Christianity appeared, and it is interesting to investigate how the relation between these two developed, how tensions occurred and disappeared, whilst this development also reveals what was thought in different periods of the intervention of God, the Miracle. We can best follow the process by investigating the attitude towards the use of medicines and the opinion on possession. The first Christians were opposed to, or at least hesitant about, the use of medicines, although they approved of the "Book of Noah" on medicines¹ and of the books attributed to Solomon.² TATIAN is of the opinion that the use of medicines is at most permitted to heathens, but not to Christians.³ The great Fathers of the Church, however, did not reject medical science as such, according to Von Harnack.

Just as in science, the Middle Ages presented a depressing aspect in medical matters. The monks had mainly to put their trust in supernatural aid. In imitation of Ambrose, Bernard of Clairvaux forbade certain monks in a letter to use medicines, and it was later laid down in canon law that medical instructions were in conflict with divine knowledge.⁴ Repeatedly physicians were forbidden to

the passus on Galen in Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.*, V, XXVIII, 13-14 (p. 75 ff.).

¹ Book of Jubilees, 10 : 10-14; cf. the Midrash on Noah, VON HARNACK, *op. cit.*, p. 57. The good spirits taught Noah about the healing power of plants. The wise men of various countries translated it. The work dates from the Middle Ages, and is intended "ad maiorem gloriam" of the Jews . . . Moses was also instructed in medicine in Egypt, see CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Strom.*, I, XXIII, 153.

² SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, III, p. 299 ff. "Auch in christlichen Kreisen hat es salomonische Zauberbücher gegeben." Cf. FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, VIII, II, 5.

Reference may also be made here to the positive attitude with regard to physicians in Jesus Sirach, Ch. 38, in which a pupil is taught to observe moderation in eating and caution regarding disease. "Honour the physician, as is his due, so that he be at your disposal, for the Lord created him too." Jesus Sirach goes on to say that healing comes from the Almighty; that the Lord creates medicines from the earth which a sensible man shall not scorn and by means of which the physician stills pain. On the results of physicians he says: "Sometimes success really lies in their hands, for they too will pray to the Lord that they may succeed in bringing relief and healing." See KAUTZSCH, *Apokr. u. Pseudepigr. des A.T.*, I, p. 416 ff.

³ TATIAN, *Oratio ad Graecos*, cap. 20. VON HARNACK, *Mission u. Ausbreitung*, I, p. 135: "Was die therapeutischen Methoden anbelangt, so war es wie heute; je weltflüchtiger und weltfeindlicher die Christen waren, um so skeptischer und erbitterter waren sie auch gegen die übliche Behandlungsweise."

⁴ TITUS, *Natur u. Gott*, p. 184; WHITE, *Histoire de la Lutte entre la Science*

treat someone without the approval of the Church, and every Christian was strictly forbidden to receive treatment from a Jewish doctor. Surgery in particular fell into disfavour; dissection was prohibited, in connection with the theory also stated in the Talmud that among the bones of the human body there is an imperishable, unburnable bone at the end of the spinal cord, the *luz*, around which the new body will form at the Resurrection.¹ A number of saints were proclaimed as medical deliverers: St. Vitus cured epilepsy, St. Ovidius could be invoked in cases of deafness, etc.

It will be appreciated that, as theologians were opposed to the view that diseases could be reduced to natural causes, the masses on the one hand addressed their pleas to God and the saints and on the other hand took refuge in all kinds of charms and amulets. They pinned their faith to supernatural intervention or protection; they sought healing outside medical science. In this connection we may refer to the strange fact that "spiritual" renunciation of official medicine still fascinates countless numbers today and holds them enthralled. There are certain groups and movements which, on the strength of their religious convictions or spiritual insight, are opposed both to the use of medicines and to medical techniques such as vaccination and X-ray examination.

Christian Science is a particularly typical example. "It is plain that God does not employ drugs or hygiene, nor provide them for human use, else Jesus would have recommended and employed them in his healing," wrote the founder of Christian Science, MARY BAKER EDDY.² And she shrinks from no single

et la Théologie, p. 307. Cf. LINDEBOOM, *Geschiedenis der Geneeskunde*, p. 88 ff., on the practice of medicine by the monks.

¹ Levit. r., XVIII, 1: "And the almond shall blossom refers to the *luz* (nut) of the spinal column. Hadrian, may his bones be crushed, asked R. Joshua b. Hananiah, saying: 'From which part of the body will the Holy One, blessed be He, in the Time to Come, cause man to sprout forth?' He answered: 'From the nut of the spinal column.' Said he: 'How can you convince me?.' He thereupon brought one before him; he put it in water, but it was not dissolved; he let it pass through millstones, but it was not ground; he put it in fire, but it was not burnt; he put it on an anvil and began beating it with a hammer, but the anvil was flattened out, and the hammer was split, but all this had no effect" (transl. J. Israelstam). WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 321. Andreas Vesalius, the celebrated anatomist and personal physician of Charles V and Philip II, also sought this bone; he fell under suspicion because he was content to say that he left it to the theologians to solve the problem of the existence of this bone; he had not found it. See also PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 72; TRIUS, *op. cit.*, p. 185; JAKOVITS, *Jewish Medical Ethics*, pp. 132-152, on "anatomical dissection." There is "a practically universal religious antagonism to dissection" (p. 134).

² BAKER EDDY, *Science and Health*, p. 143; cf. p. 157. "Jesus never asked if

disease, organic or functional, whether it be tuberculosis, cancer or stomach trouble, for "what is termed disease does not exist. It is neither mind nor matter."¹ "The remedy is Truth, not matter—the truth that disease is unreal."² "Sin, sickness and death are to be classified as effects of error."³ It is understandable that protests have also been lodged from medical quarters against this piece of mental gymnastics. LIEK describes this movement as a "degenerate Christianity," which "debases prayer to a business proposition;"⁴ this forms a sharp contrast to his appreciative opinion of the healings at Möttlingen, Teichwollramsdorf, etc.⁵

Let us now return to the first Christians; their medicines were of a spiritual nature and consisted of prayer, the laying-on of hands and exorcism.⁶ Healing was thus expected from an immediate intervention by God. To understand this attitude—for why should they not have been equally able to seek a cure from "worldly" medicines?—one must bear in mind the critical circumstances in which the Christians lived in the first centuries. Despised, maligned, persecuted, they sought a certain isolation, withdrawing from everything that bore any similarity to heathendom. But this isolation did not lead to fanaticism or obscurantism. For it was not without avail that one of the authors of the New Testament had been a physician, viz. Luke (Col. 4 : 14, Philemon 24, 2 Tim. 4 : 11); "an Antiochene by origin, a physician by profession," according to EUSEBIUS,⁷ with all respect to the omission by Marcion in Col. 4 : 14 and the arguments adduced by FENNER and others that Luke was not a doctor.⁸ Ac-

disease were acute or chronic, and he never recommended attention to laws of health, never gave drugs, never prayed to know if God were willing that a man should live" (p. 369).

¹ BAKER EDDY, op. cit., p. 188.

² BAKER EDDY, op. cit., p. 229.

³ BAKER EDDY, op. cit., p. 473.

⁴ LIEK, *Het wonder in de geneeskunde*, p. 64; cf. BARTH, K.D., III, 4, p. 414 ff., who says that we are definitely not concerned here with *Christian science*. HAGGARD, op. cit., p. 219 ff.

⁵ LIEK, op. cit., p. 64.

⁶ VON HARNACK, op. cit., p. 66.

⁷ EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, III, IV, 6.

⁸ In Marcion's text there appears: "Luke and Demas greet you" (see VON HARNACK, *Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, Leipzig 1924, Beilagen, p. 124). FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 107 ff. FENNER argues that Luke was not a physician, since he (a) describes in Lk. 8 : 43 the failure of physicians; (b) uses a mocking expression referring to physicians in Lk. 4 : 23; (c) proves not to be acquainted with the views of Hippocrates and, like the other authors, ascribes mental disease to demons, and even, in Lk. 13 : 16, ascribes contracture to Satan.

according to VON HARNACK, it is a good thing for the Church to remember that Luke was a physician. "He protected his science, medicine, in the Church and triumphantly averted for the Catholic Church the final consequences of a Christianity shunning nature."¹ In his *History of the Church*, EUSEBIUS refers at several places with appreciation and admiration to Christian physicians; he tells how the Phrygian physician Alexander died a martyr's death;² he recounts how "the splendid physician Zenobius" died courageously "of the wounds dealt him in his sides",³ and praises Bishop Theodotus as "very skilled in the healing of bodies," and supreme "in his power of healing minds."⁴ Hieronymus mentions in his work on famous men the names of Flavius and of Bishop Basilius of Ancyra, a man "skilled in medicine," whilst the ecclesiastical historian Philostorgius praises Aëtius, an able physician who would never take a fee.⁵

The attitude of the early Christians is thus ambivalent: on the one hand they regard Christ as the only physician who can help them without medicines, and on the other hand various priests devote themselves to medicine and often acquire for themselves an excellent reputation.

In the second place we mentioned the opinion on possession. Although in the chapter dealing with the healing of demoniacs by Jesus we shall speak at length of demonology, we should like at this stage to draw attention to certain important points, since the conflict between theological and medical views is the most pronounced on the subject of possession. Belief in demons as producers of disease and authors of every conceivable disaster is universal. In Jesus' day the inhabitants of Palestine lived as it were under the spell of demons. In the first centuries of the Christian era the belief in demons grew steadily, and in the Middle Ages it reached unprecedented heights. Although famous physicians such as Hippocrates, Soranus,

GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 92, also believes that the "so-called" medical language which Luke uses is "not sufficiently technical, however, to prove that he was a physician." Recently DE JONG, a doctor, advanced the proposition in his *Demonische Ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel* that "the opinion that the author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles was a physician is unsupported by the text of these works" (cf. also p. 95).

¹ VON HARNACK, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

² EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, V, 1, 49-51.

³ EUSEBIUS, *op. cit.*, VIII, XIII, 4.

⁴ EUSEBIUS, *op. cit.*, VII, XXXII, 23.

⁵ See VON HARNACK, *op. cit.*, p. 47. Cf. VON HARNACK, *Mission u. Ausbreitung*, p. 133.

Galen and Posidonius did not believe in demons, and ascribed possession to an "abnormal movement of the juices in the head" or to "decay of the juices in the body,"¹ the great masses, both the lettered and the unlettered, continued with bitter obstinacy to adhere to their belief in devils. Pagan and Christian exorcists took the field against demons, the Christian practitioners standing aloof from the pagan ones, since demons could only really be overcome "in the name of Jesus," because only Christ had broken the power of Satan. ORIGEN states that the name of Jesus "has already driven tens of thousands of demons from souls and bodies."² Zeno of Verona (fourth century) tells how the hovering unclean spirits penetrated the souls of the living, and when they were exorcised in the name of Jesus, the eyes of the victims rolled as they sighed and lamented.³ During divine service on feast days, according to Gregory of Tours (sixth century), the possessed were roused to a frenzy and smashed the lamps. But when the oil from the lamps dripped down on them, the demons fled.⁴ Nowhere do the pages of history reveal darker periods in the belief in demons than in the Middle Ages. OESTERREICH says that in the biographies and legends of the saints the same old stories of the exorcism of the possessed recur with wearisome monotony.⁵ The witch hunts were pursued with unsparing ferocity. Neither the opposition of the physician Johannes Wierus, "the intrepid protector of so-called witches"⁶ (although he personally believed in the devil and magic), nor the courageous resistance of the Amsterdam divine Balthasar Bekker in his book "The World

¹ F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 127.

² ORIGEN, *c. Celsum*, I, 25; cf. I, 46, on the Christians: "They conjure demons, and perform many healings, and by virtue of the will of the Word they have some insight into future [things]."

In *c. Celsum*, VII, 4, Origen says how the Christians expel the demons: "with not a single artificial or magical or venomous practice, but solely by prayer and fairly simple conjurations." Cf. *c. Celsum*, I, 6; IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, II, 31, 2 and 3. JUSTIN writes in his *Apologia*: "For many of our people, namely of the Christians, have healed many throughout the whole world and also in your own capital who were possessed by demons and had not been healed by all the exorcists and sorcerers and mountebanks, by speaking the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, yea, heal them even now, by calming and expelling the demons which reside in the people" (II, 6). Cf. JUSTIN, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 30; 49; 76; 85.

³ OESTERREICH, *Die Besessenheit*, p. 6.

⁴ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

⁵ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 171 ff.

⁶ BASCHWITZ, *De strijd met den duivel*, p. 20.

Bewitched," the publication of which caused the "Bekkerian war" (in which Bekker suffered defeat and was deposed from his office by synodal decree) was able to put a stop to belief in demons and the terrible consequences of this. The Reformers Luther, Calvin, Beza, etc., were convinced of the existence of demons. Doubt and denial were severely punished; in the sixteenth century Professor Cornelis Loos died in prison of the plague as a result of the publication of his work on "The True and False Magic," whilst Dietrich Flade was strangled and burnt.¹ As late as 1768 the Methodist John Wesley wrote that to abandon the belief in magic meant in reality to abandon belief in the Bible.² But when in that same year a declaration of the Parliament of Paris appeared, stating that the possessed had simply to be regarded as "sick," the turn of the tide came.³ And after Philippe Pinel became the medical director of the asylum at Bicêtre, a period of milder treatment set in for the mentally ill. The chains were struck off these unfortunates, and Pinel sought new forms of cure, in the firm conviction that lunacy did not have supernatural but natural, physical causes. In England Pinel found an ally in William Tuke. But violent opposition arose from theological quarters, so that Tuke, in a dispirited mood, once even wrote: "everyone is deserting me."⁴ Not until the end of the nineteenth century was the treatment of the mentally ill energetically conducted along new medical lines. The Lunatics' Tower in Vienna was a place of public entertainment in Vienna right up to 1853.⁵

The last word has definitely not been said about demonology. OESTERREICH points to three circles in the modern culture of Central Europe in which the belief in demoniac possession is still held, viz. strict Catholicism, the right wing of Protestantism and Spiritualism.⁶ Roman Catholicism holds the dogmatic attitude that possession by

¹ WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 245.

² WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 249. ZORAB, *Magnetiseurs en Wondergenezers*, p. 27 f. About 1775 Pater Gassner operated as a healer in Bavaria by laying on hands. According to Gassner, sick persons were people possessed by evil spirits. The healings happened immediately or after a short treatment. Most of the patients were women and girls . . . But the celebrated Dutch physician Anton de Haen (1704-1776), who had been a pupil of Boerhave and who in 1756 was appointed professor of practical medicine in Vienna, also believed in magic and possession by demons and witchcraft. See LINDEBOOM, *Geschiedenis der Geneeskunde*, p. 212 f.

³ WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 368, cf. HAGGARD, *op. cit.*, p. 270 ff.

⁴ WHITE, *op. cit.*, p. 372.

⁵ HAGGARD, *op. cit.*, p. 270. Cf. STAFFORD-CLARK, *Psychiatry To-day*, pp. 9-34.

⁶ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 192 ff.

demons still occurs, but in practice very great caution is observed. The pathological cases among the mentally ill must be carefully distinguished from those in which evil spirits are in fact at work. If the latter is the case, the bishop must be informed, for then the treatment must be exorcism. There is a "*Manuale Exorcismorum*" in which the ritual for exorcism is laid down. The exorcist must first pray and fast. The place where the demon is to be driven out is the church or a consecrated place; only in urgent cases may use be made of a private home. Women, children and the curious have to be kept away. The exorcist must speak "constantly and with great faith" (*constanter et magna cum fide*). He conjures the demon to leave its victim "in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost," whilst he repeatedly makes the sign of the cross.¹

We may leave out of consideration the views of Spiritualism, whilst we shall return later to those of Protestantism, with its various shades of opinion.

If we look at the picture as a whole, we come to the following conclusion. The tension which has occurred between theology and medicine throughout the centuries of Christianity is a part of the sum total of stresses between the science of theology and other sciences or, to be more precise, between the practitioners on both sides.

It is fairly easy to look back from our days, in which medicine achieves one striking success after the other, and smile at the opposition and the reserve of the theologians. But, to understand the theological attitude properly, matters must be considered objectively and in their historical framework. Then, it seems to us, there are two points to which attention must be paid, namely the theological background and the experiences in practice.

Many see in the rapidly advancing influence and power of science in all kinds of fields a permanent attack on religion: they believe that the front is widening steadily and the defence line of Christianity

¹ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 98 ff., cf. FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 26; EITREM, *Demonology*, p. 53 f.: "The expulsion of Satan and his devils was accepted by the early Christian church. It figures today still in the *Rituale Romanum*, a real relic of the beginnings of Christianity." BLESS, *Pastorale Psychiatrie*, p. 101: "Whilst formerly perhaps far too much was ascribed to the Devil and to evil spirits, the possibility exists in any case." BLESS says that one must proceed cautiously "but secure information and advice from a competent and cautious doctor and psychiatrist. After permission from the ecclesiastical authorities exorcism can be applied in a real case of possession" (p. 102).

shrinking and weakening all the time. The supernatural, the "Miracle," is to them losing more and more ground to the natural, to "knowledge," quite apart from a large number of other factors (political, social, economic, etc.) which they think are undermining belief in God and in His revelation in Jesus Christ.

It is our opinion that things must not be seen in this light. Science as such must never be confused with its practitioners, nor may we objectify certain conclusions drawn by disbelieving investigators who tend towards a certain outlook on the world and on life. Moreover, and in our opinion too little attention is paid to this, it may never be forgotten that all other sciences have a great "lead" (if the term may be permitted) on theology: they are not accompanied by any binding book. The literature of Hippocrates and Galen, of Paré and Vesalius, to mention only a few of the celebrated older medical pioneers, may accompany medical studies as an interesting subject of study, but it is not binding. Every new and superior form of therapy quietly replaces an old one, and new surgical discoveries simply oust existing methods of treatment.

However, things are fundamentally different with Christian theology. The book which has accompanied it for nigh on 2000 years does not merely contain literature of theological interest; as the "Word of God" it is binding, it is normative. But the contents of the Bible stand in the historical framework of twenty and more centuries ago, and the question now is: how must this book speak both with reliability and with topicality again and again, at a given stage of science, without being repeatedly worked on and adapted or perhaps being completely demythologized in the end? The certain inertia and tenacity of theological science and its inclination towards lengthy reflection, even towards opposition, are indeed not in the least incomprehensible. And this is so not only because of theology's ties with the Bible, but also because of its many experiences, because of its confrontation with scientific errors in the rapidly changing succession of theories. In the Middle Ages, when God was still seen as the direct cause of diseases which served as a punishment and a warning, when possession was ascribed to demons, was it really absurd that attempts were made to treat the supernatural in "supernatural" fashion, viz. by prayers and holy water, by formulas and signs of the cross, by visits to graves and statues, by all kinds of practices of exorcism? Might not the theologians and monks, the culture-bearers of that time—remember for instance the medical

studies of the Benedictines and the celebrated school of Salerno—have noticed that the remedies prescribed by the physicians failed repeatedly? And what do the masses do if the official healer does not give relief? The situation today is still the same; the aid is sought of the paranormally gifted, of quacks and cure-alls! We are inclined to forget all too soon that right into the nineteenth century vomiting, purging and blood-letting were well in the forefront of standard medical practices, and in fact are still applied in special cases. There is indeed a very great difference between the pharmacology of the previous century and that of today, and the pharmacists have radically changed too! VAN ANDEL, a medical man, describes in his priceless book on “classical panaceas” a varied selection of strange medicines which were believed to be infallible, particularly in the treatment of mysterious diseases. Blood, applied both externally and internally, cured leprosy and epilepsy. Richard III and Louis IX, both sufferers from leprosy, are said to have bathed in the blood of children. In prescriptions from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the hippomanes, a strange humour from the womb of a mare, is praised as an infallible remedy for epilepsy. The adeps hominis, human fat, was a splendid salve, and after the massacre of St. Bartholomew in 1572 in Lyons the fattest victims were taken to the apothecaries, whilst the priestly fat of the martyrs of Gorcum was also in great demand. And what are we to think of usnea, i.e. moss scraped from the skull of a hanged criminal, which right into the nineteenth century was an official medicine, obtainable from every apothecary!

The first edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* devotes an article to the therapeutical value of this moss. HAGGARD states that usnea was to be found on the prescriptions of all well-known physicians for a period extending from the Middle Ages until after the American Revolution.¹ Many other strange “medicines” might be mentioned; but those given may suffice to show that quite a lot has changed in medical science and the pharmacopoeia.

If, then, the point of view of Church dogma, particularly that of earlier centuries, is to be judged correctly and objectively, allowance will also have to be made for the scientific position and the poor results of medicine at that time; if that is done, the clergy will probably no longer be seen as merely a brake on civilization and progress.²

¹ HAGGARD, *op. cit.*, p. 234 . . . Extensive textual material regarding the theory of medicine in Antiquity appears in ELAUT, *Antieke Geneeskunde*.

² HAGGARD, *op. cit.*, p. 211, argues that nothing has so greatly retarded the

And, as far as the "conservatism" of the Church is concerned, the following may not be forgotten: every novelty or renovation undergoes criticism and meets with opposition. This holds good for every manifestation of culture, of science and art; it applies to political and social matters. His colleagues reproached Paracelsus for his mockery of Galen; Edward Jenner was jeered at by doctors when he put forward his plan to inoculate people with vaccine derived from cows; the lives of Pasteur and R. Koch did not go by without attacks from professional know-alls. A certain inertia and attachment to old ideas is definitely not peculiar to the Church!

Both in the opposition to the use of medicine and in the conflict about the treatment of possession, the real issue was the belief in the supernatural, in miracles. Would Christ, who had cured so many of the sick, not always be capable of healing the sick by His spirit in answer to prayer? Could not the prayers of sufferers always be answered by "thy faith hath made thee whole?" And why—looking at things through medieval eyes—should the mentally ill not be treated by an "in the name of Jesus," just as the apostles and the earlier exorcists did with spectacular results, as a wealth of literature ensures us? Anyone who regards the tension and the conflicts between theolo-

growth of scientific medicine in the course of the last two thousand years as the iron grip of theology in the maintenance of practices which were based on belief in the supernatural origin of disease . . . More cautious, and certainly more unpretentious and matter-of-fact, is the remark which Sigerist, *A History of Medicine*, makes concerning the conjurations by Egyptian physicians, as are encountered in the Ebers Papyrus and the Edwin Smith Papyrus. "If we are honest we must admit that until very recently much of our internal therapy was not so very different from magic, although the language of science was used" (p. 314). . . . The "tension" between the representatives of the medical and the ecclesiastical world is also clearly perceptible in the otherwise sympathetic and enlightening work by KLOEK, *De verhouding van geloof en medische wetenschap*. He doubts the possibility of close cooperation between the doctor (the man of action) and the minister of religion (the man of talk), and speaks of "resentment" which wells up in the doctor when the minister of religion begins to speak in stereotyped terms (p. 12 f.). We agree with his proposition: "The doctor must be extremely sceptical towards miraculous healings" (p. 42). We come to the heart of "tension and conflict" with the pronouncement: "I believe that, generally speaking, faith is a more difficult matter for the doctor than for his believing patient" (p. 14). Klock explains that this is because of his "science," which in all kinds of ways "has completely transformed the background of his philosophy." To put it bluntly, this argument is absurd. Medical science is, as knowledge, just as human as any other branch of human science; it does not possess the slightest additional value! Cf. for the contact between doctor (psychiatrist) and minister of religion the instructive works of NOLLE, *Arts en Predikant*; GÖDAN, *Christus u. Hippokrates*.

gy and medical science against a purely modern scientific background cannot understand what came over those people, with their "superstition and obscurantism." He does not understand that they had pinned their faith to God! Ambroise Paré, the great surgeon of princes and soldiers, did understand, when he answered praise of himself with: "I do not heal the soldiers; I only nurse them and bind their wounds. The healing comes from God."

Since the Middle Ages there have been immense changes. Who can deny that medical science has achieved wonderful results, for the great benefit of mankind? It seems to us unthinkable that any Church would, for instance, lay down a dogma against the new medicinal therapy. But if a practitioner of medical science, on the strength of certain theories, believes that he can deny the effect of divine power on psychosomatic life or if he is of the opinion that the healings of Jesus must be explained in a natural medical manner, he is no longer speaking as a doctor, but from a certain outlook on life. And who can blame the theologian for raising objections then?

(b) *The belief in supernatural causes of disease*

As we saw above, the battle between theology and medicine is waged around the supernatural, around miracles. To put it in medical terms, the issue is aetiology, the science of the causes of disease. Medical science is concerned only with the strict laws of cause and effect; it asks itself where the natural source of the process of disease is hidden, physically and mentally. Besides this rational aetiology we also encounter another one, the religious one. We have already pointed to the widespread belief in demons as producers of disease, but there are also a number of other powers causing illness. The history of religions is opening up an interesting field in this respect, and to be able to explain and understand the special nature of the healings in the New Testament, it is important to study the historico-religious background, so that both the analogies and the dissimilarities become evident.

In 1924 an imposing study by RIVERS was published, which was described by G. Elliott Smith in a foreword as "a contribution of unique value to the history of medicine."¹ RIVERS' research covered Melanesia and New Guinea. He says: "If we examine the beliefs of mankind in general concerning the causation of disease, we find that the causes may be grouped in three chief classes: (1)

¹ RIVERS, *Medicine, Magic and Religion*, p. V.

human agency, in which it is believed that disease is directly due to action on the part of some human being; (2) the action of some spiritual or supernatural being or, more exactly, the action of some agent who is not human, but is yet more or less definitely personified; and (3) what we ordinarily call natural causes. Among ourselves there are indications of the presence of all three kinds of belief, and this was certainly so in the not very remote past." RIVERS goes on to say that among primitive peoples class (3) is hardly ever encountered.¹ This classification by RIVERS has its advantages, but the connection between (1) and (2) is so intimate that in our opinion the ordinary classification into two groups, the "supernatural" and the "natural," can best be retained. For if a certain form of human action is considered as producing disease, this action will always have to be more closely studied, and it will be found that in some way or the other demoniac power or magical practices are nevertheless involved. For instance, RIVERS refers to a method used by the Melanesians for inducing disease, the "ghost-shooter," which can kill a healthy man within a few days.² This is a bamboo stick, filled with all kinds of ingredients, which is aimed at the victim; suggestion does the rest. Or the Australian witchdoctor points a piece of a dead man's bone at his victim, and the victim is subjected to a deadly influence.³ The "evil eye" can likewise cause disease, but this is in no way seen as a natural power of the eye; the eyes are regarded as the sally-ports of demons.

We need not concern ourselves here with the natural causes of disease, but what now is the power which induces disease in supernatural fashion? This may be a "good" power, the Divinity, who visits man with disease for a certain purpose, but it can also be an "evil" power which, driven by a malign urge to destroy, attacks man. The field which stretches before us is boundless, and we can therefore only outline the most important aspects. The whole ancient Eastern world lived under the curse of demons. "They are everywhere; they make their way into everything; neither doors nor bolts stop them; they cover the earth like grass," said the old Babylonians. All suffering, every disaster, illness and accident was the work of evil spirits. Small wonder that in the Assyro-Babylonian world medicine consisted in magic: drive out the devils and the sick man

¹ RIVERS, *op. cit.*, p. 7 f.

² RIVERS, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

³ RIVERS, *op. cit.*, p. 61.

will recover! "The fear of magicians and demons must have embittered private life," writes BÖHL.¹ And the same may be said about the entire ancient world in the days in which Jesus Christ lived.² But even after the Christian faith had found acceptance in many countries, the belief in demons as the producers of disease continued, not least through the influence of Christianity itself. For once the gods of the pagans had been characterized by the Christians as demons, they were denounced as the bringers of all kinds of calamities.³ AUGUSTINE writes that all diseases of the Christians must be ascribed to these demons; they principally torment newly baptized Christians, and even newborn innocent children.⁴ We have already spoken of the height reached in the Middle Ages by belief in demons. STEPLINGER says of this: "Whatsoever belief there was in ancient, Oriental, Celtic and Germanic spirits flowed into the medieval belief in devils as into a receptacle."⁵

In a study of the treatment of sick and elderly people among primitive folks, KOTY describes by means of all kinds of examples

¹ F. M. T. BÖHL in Van der Leeuw, "De Godsdiensten der wereld," I, p. 146.

² PREISKER, *Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 181: "Das Leben des Menschen ist erfüllt von Furcht vor Dämonen, die zwischen Himmel und Erde und auch im Menschen hausen." STEPLINGER, *Antiker Aberglaube*, p. 19: "Der Dämonenglaube beherrscht das antike Volkstum der Griechen und Römer ebenso wie das der Orientalen."

³ According to ORIGEN Apollo is a demon "who is given an offering of a libation and greasy smoke" (c. Celsum, III, 28), but God has sent Jesus to scatter every assault by the demons (III, 29). The Christians teach "that all the gods of the pagans are greedy demons (*δαίμόνια λίχνα*)" (III, 37). "The [truths] concerning the demons are further also clear from those that invoke demons in the generation of love or hate, or when hindered in their practices, or for countless other [things] of that kind. That is done by those who have learned to summon up demons by conjurations and sorcery and to spur them on to what they wish. Therefore the service of all demons is foreign to us, who do homage to the God Above All. And service of demons is also service of fancied gods. 'All the gods of the pagans' are naught but 'demons' . . . And therefore we have deemed it well to shun the service of demons as undoing. But we say that service of demons is every service before altars and images and in temples of gods considered as such by the Greeks." (VII, 69). TERTULLIAN also ascribes heresies to the "spiritual forces of evil;" heresies are the work of the Devil. *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, XL. "Et ideo neque a diabolo immissa esse spiritalia nequitiae, ex quibus etiam haereses veniunt, dubitare quis debet, neque ab idololatria distare haereses, cum et auctoris et operis eiusdem sint cuius et idololatria."

⁴ AUGUSTINE, *De divin. daemonum*, 3; see STEPLINGER, *Antiker Aberglaube*, p. 21, who comments: "Diese Ansicht wird fast bei allen anderen Kirchenvätern verfochten und geht über in die mittelalterliche Weltanschauung bis herauf zu Luther."

⁵ STEPLINGER, *op. cit.*, p. 21 f.

how deeply belief in demons as the producers of disease is rooted. Again and again it is fear that causes man to take refuge in the strangest and cruellest forms of defence.¹ Practically everywhere in the world we find three diseases described as particularly dangerous: possession, epilepsy and leprosy (cf. the New Testament). Some peoples, for instance the Kalmucks of Central Asia, do also apply medical treatment, whilst the Masai in East Africa have reached a fairly high standard of development in medicine and never impute internal diseases to evil spirits or to the influences of an enemy, but these are exceptions all the same.² We may recall here the views of P. WILHELM SCHMIDT, who is responsible for a final synthesis of the religions of the primeval peoples of America, Asia, Australia and Africa, in which he argues, among other things, that in the primordial culture of these peoples the diseases were not believed to be caused by evil spirits. SCHMIDT is of the opinion that the elements of animism, magic, etc., were not present in the primordial cultures, or only faintly so, and believes that he can establish the way in which the origin and nature of disease must have been regarded in the oldest religions of the primordial cultures. "In no case is it believed to have been caused by possession by a spirit, which would therefore have to be driven out by special treatment by a shaman. But there are material, impersonal ingredients (stones, arrow-heads, blood, often small animals as well), which have penetrated the body and must now be massaged, pressed or sucked out, or removed by prayer and song addressed to the Highest Being or spirits subordinate to Him. Still less do we encounter here an actual shamanism, in which the shaman himself is possessed by a spirit which speaks and acts from him and through him."³

¹ KOTY, *Die Behandlung der Alten u. Kranken b.d. Naturvölkern*. Cf. among others KLUIN, *Het geestesleven der natuurvölkern*, p. 47. Fijis, Torajas and other peoples believe that disease penetrates man from outside as a fluid emanated by gods, demons or living beings. KRUYT, *Het Animisme in de Ind. Archipel*; WARNECK, *Die Lebenskräfte des Evangeliums*, p. 110 f.: "Die animistischen Heiden sind nicht nur Irrende, sie sind Sklaven, Unfreie. Dreierlei macht sie zu Gebundenen: die Furcht, der Dämonendienst und das Fatum . . . Die Furcht ist die bewegende Kraft der animistischen Religion in Asien wie in Afrika." HEILER, *Das Gebet*, p. 87: "Unglück und Not, vor allem Krankheit ist für den primitiven Menschen eine Folge des Zornes eines höheren Wesens, den man auf irgendeine Weise, sei es durch Verletzung eines Ritualgebotes, sei es durch die Übertretung der von Gott gesetzten ethischen Ordnung, erregt hat."

² KOTY, *op. cit.*, pp. 56, 112.

³ SCHMIDT, *Endsynthese der Religionen*, p. 382.

SCHMIDT is thus opposed to the animistic theory; he assumes that magic plays an unimportant role in primordial culture and believes that disease was regarded either as a punishment by the Highest Being or reduced to natural causes. He argues all this in connection with his theory of primordial monotheism, which is contested from various quarters.¹ The history of religions describes at great length how the disease-producing demons take possession of man in all kinds of ways. According to the Semang in South-East Asia they use winds; they attack unsuspecting man whilst he is performing all kinds of actions (it is still believed in parts of the Middle East that if a child urinates into an open fire the spirits, the djinn, living in that fire will attack the child; disease seizes those who shout loudly in a well after dark or play in a churchyard.)² The demons use certain times (night, noon, Fridays) and certain places (ruins, trees, wells, lonely places, etc.) and they disguise themselves as snakes, scorpions, cats, etc., attacking the unsuspecting passer-by in this form.³ The "evil eye" also plays a major role. CANAAN recalls the Palestinian saying: "God protect us from three things: the one-eyed man, because of his insolence; the bald-headed man, because of his repugnant appearance, and the beardless man, because of the power of his eye."⁴ It is sometimes claimed that an invisible, poisonous substance is released from the evil eye which attacks the victim. As the evil eye can strike consciously or unconsciously—a person can therefore harm quite innocently—it is expedient to arm oneself against the evil eye in every possible way, by amulets or by speaking the name of God.⁵ The obstinacy with which such a belief lives on is

¹ See among others PETTAZZONI, RGG, IV, art. Monotheismus und Polytheismus, col. 189 f.; HEILER, *Das Gebet*, sees as the double root of religion a primitive "monotheism" and a germ-like "pantheism," p. 131. BLEEKER, *Het christendom en de godsdiensten der aarde*, I, points to the belief in an exalted, remote god held by many primitive peoples. "Is this a primordial monotheism? Probably not. It is rather an attempt to give a religious, a mythical explanation of the world order and of the goods of civilized man, which are regarded as a great blessing" (p. 105). See also BLEEKER, *De structuur van de godsdienst*, pp. 15, 36, 93; HIDDING, *Mens en Godsdienst*, p. 30 ff.; VAN BAAREN, *Wij mensen*, p. 56 ff.

² CANAAN, *Aberglaube*, p. 11; CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 47. Cf. SIMONS, *Bijgeloof en godsdiende*, p. 14, as regards the Atlantic negro zones.

³ BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 11, on Friday as the day of creation of the demons. That is why Friday is an unlucky day. On Easter eve the demons are powerless; see p. 13. Cf. CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 19. Many fellahin leave a small oil lamp burning at night. CANAAN, *Aberglaube*, p. 12. Cf. the chapter: *The Healing of the Possessed*.

⁴ CANAAN, *Aberglaube*, p. 28.

⁵ CANAAN, *Aberglaube*, p. 77 ff. Cf. L. BAUER, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*,

illustrated by the fact that THOMAS AQUINAS adjudged it necessary to devote a passage to the evil eye, into which the "finer spirits" penetrate. When, says THOMAS, a soul is agitated by emotion, as is particularly the case with old women, the gaze of the person concerned becomes "poisonous and harmful" (*venenosus et noxius*), especially to children, whose bodies are highly sensitive to impressions.¹

CANAAN makes a distinction between the "evil soul" and the "evil eye." The evil soul can, by breathing, transmit evil powers of the soul which do the victim all kinds of harm.² The belief in supernatural evil forces that cause disease, operating with or without the aid of human beings, animals or objects, displays inexhaustible vitality.

TROELS LUND devoted a study to the various views held in the sixteenth century, and found the following supernatural explanations in that century: (a) disease is caused by God; (b) it is caused by the Devil; (c) it is caused by the stars. Henrik Ranzau, in his famous work "The Preservation of Health" (*De conservanda valetudine*), drew attention to belief in the stars as the cause of disease. According to many the moon and planets exert a great influence; the seventh, fourteenth and twentieth days are regarded as "critical" days in the course of an illness.³ Besides these supernatural explanations TROELS LUND mentions a number of other explanations from the sixteenth century, which can be called more or less rational. Disease was believed to be the result of an incorrect balance between the juices of the body; it is something "negative" which is eliminated by the "positivum" of the medicine; it is another, individual form of life, a mystery that must be rectified by means of another mystery, an antidote.⁴ The view just mentioned was propounded by Paracelsus

p. 197. El-ain, the eye, the "evil eye," is: "die verbreitetste Form des Aberglaubens."

¹ THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa Theologiae*, I, qu. CXVII, art. III.

² CANAAN, *Aberglaube*, p. 32. The evil soul harms only consciously and directly; the evil eye also works unconsciously and indirectly, i.e. also on absent persons.

³ TROELS LUND, *Gesundheit u. Krankheit*, pp. 80 ff., 181 ff. Cf. ORIGEN, c. Celsum, I, 59, on the appearance of comets at the time of great events. STEMP-LINGER, op. cit., p. 28: "Beda Venerabilis erklärte im 8-Jahrhundert, Kometen seien die Boten von Revolution, Pest, Krieg, Sturm oder Dürre. Rhabanus Maurus, Thomas von Aquin, Albertus Magnus, teilten alle diese Ansicht." See also DIJKSTERHUIS, *De mechanisering van het wereldbeeld*, p. 93 ff. and p. 170 ff. HOOYKAAS, in Waszink et al, *Het oudste christendom en de antieke cultuur*, I, pp. 170-178, *De Astrologie*. TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, pp. 249-259, *Astrology*.

⁴ TROELS LUND, op. cit., p. 153 ff.

(1493—1541), who believed that he could bring a new gospel by linking the message of the Bible to certain ancient ways of thought.¹

Considering the above, we can listen with approval to RIVERS as he says: "The diseases of one part of the world are so much like those of another that I should have regarded it as the most natural thing in the world that mankind should have evolved similar beliefs concerning the nature of disease and similar practices by which to modify or neutralize its effects."²

The belief in supernatural forces, both good and evil, which produce disease is common to the whole of mankind. In the past it was widespread; now many peoples no longer hold it. Particularly in cases of the sudden occurrence of a disease, in illnesses of a special kind or in epidemics, thoughts tended to go—and still go—to the direct intervention of supernatural powers. The modern scholar, who works solely on a rational basis, believes that this "primitive" attitude must be persistently opposed. For instance, HAGGARD has spoken very negatively of the belief in supernatural causes of disease. He argues that there is a double philosophical foundation of medicine: the primitive one, which is based on superstition, and the rational, modern, one. According to HAGGARD, these are in direct opposition to one another. The first considers that disease is caused by supernatural forces, and associates disease with sin. Modern rational medicine is based on the conception that disease is the result of natural causes; it associates disease with ignorance. Modern science

¹ See DIJKSTERHUIS, *op. cit.*, p. 307 ff. According to Paracelsus all substances are built up from three principia, viz. mercury, sulphur and salt. The human body is also built up from these three principia: sulphur fosters growth; mercury determines the liquid content and salt gives shape and solidity. "Man's health depends on the equilibrium of the three principia which, once interrupted, can be restored by medicines which chemistry learns to compound from these same principia" (p. 308). Chemistry here becomes an auxiliary of medicine; this new era in chemistry is called the iatro-chemical one. LINDEBOOM, *Geschiedenis der Geneeskunde*, p. 131 ff.

² RIVERS, *op. cit.*, p. 57. VAN ANDEL, *Klassieke wondermiddelen*, p. 35, also speaks of the "remarkable similarity in the medical customs of peoples of entirely different origin and location, who can be said with a fair degree of certainty to have had not a single point of contact with one another. As such a resemblance is not exceptional, but occurs in numerous cases, it may be concluded that the human mind, at a certain stage of its development, answers the questions which present themselves to it in practically the same way, and that a critical study of the folk medicine of both natural and civilized peoples can make a not inconsiderable contribution to folk psychology and to the story of the development of human thought." Cf. SINGER, *A History of Medicine*, who says that "archaic medicine is much the same, or at least very similar, everywhere" (p. XIX).

regards disease not as supernatural or as the result of sinning against moral laws, but as the result of a breach of sanitary regulations. Modern man realizes that knowledge is all that is needed to prevent disease. Millions still look today to their priest and their gods in times of disease, instead of looking to doctors trained in medical science and hygiene.¹

In Haggard we see the type of the modern man of science, who couples with his conception of civilization and medicine a purely rational outlook on life.

Although we shall be returning to this matter in a chapter on the connection between "sin and disease" and "disease and prayer," we should like to comment here that it is not an absurdity for the Christian to see "the hand of God" both in disease and in healing, whilst at the same time, averse to every kind of quackery, miracle-healer, magical practice, etc., he also sees the "hand of God" healing and preserving in the ways and means of modern medicine. In other words, the "Christian faith" may in no way be confused with all kinds of religious trends or movements with a so-called intellectual scientific aspect, although it must be admitted that strange opponents are still to be found among the ranks of the Christians!

(c) *Doctors' opinions on the healings of Jesus*

The Bible is not a "medical" book, nor is the Talmud. But both of them have a lot to say about disease, and what is the theologian to do then? A man of medicine, W. EBSTEIN, wrote in 1903: "as a rule the theologian understands little if anything of medicine," and he concurs with his colleague J. K. Proksch that exegetes are not permitted in the slightest respect to give any opinion at all on any medical matter in the Bible. The exegetes must provide the most correct text possible: "and the doctors will then tell them what this means."² The theologian, conscious of his ignorance of medical matters, will be prepared to assent to this to a considerable extent. To a considerable extent, for it may still be asked whether the theologian's work is confined to purifying the text. Other specialists could, with the same "right," demand their share: the geographer, the

¹ HAGGARD, op. cit., p. 278. Cf. DROOGLEEVER FORTUYN, Kwakzalverij, Bijgeloof en Geneeskunst, who speaks of the "temple of medicine in which not the Greek gods are now worshipped, but Science" (p. 157) . . . We encounter another spirit in the works "Radical Therapie" and "Bijbel en Geneeskunde" by TOURNIER, a doctor.

² EBSTEIN, Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud, p. 8 ff.

archeologist, the historian, etc. could all claim their own field of study, so that the theologian would have to await the results of the specialists and then draw his conclusions from this coordinated knowledge! Besides a strictly philological field of operations, the theologian also has a theological-exegetic workshop, and the results achieved there may perhaps help the doctor to make his diagnosis or dispose him to caution in drawing his conclusions.

It seems most appropriate to start by examining the various terms for disease used in the New Testament. FENNER has studied these, but he has not gone into the meaning of the words, which we would think the most important point. The following terms are used for illness, disease, weakness:

(a) *Nosos*.¹ This is translated by "sickness" or "disease," or by "infirmity." The etymology of "nosos" is uncertain. Since Homer it has meant "disease" with the secondary meaning of misery, plague, which is perhaps the original meaning.²

(b) *Astheneia*.³ This word is translated by "infirmity," "sickness," "sick," "disease" or "weakness". Besides *astheneia* *asthenes* also occurs both as a substantive and as an adjective.⁴ The verb "*asthenein*" also occurs frequently.⁵ *A-stheneia*, *a-sthenein* means: to be weak, impotent. This weakness may be meant in the physical sense, and it may also relate to religious, ethical or social circumstances.⁶

¹ νόσος; languor. In Hebrew the verb most used for "to be ill" is חלה, from which a number of substantives have been derived. See BRONGERS, *Enkele opmerkingen over het verband tussen zonde en ziekte*, enz., p. 130. νόσος is translated by "disease" in Mt. 4 : 24; Mk. 1 : 34; Lk. 4 : 40; 6 : 17; 9 : 1; Ac. 19 : 12, by "sickness" in Mt. 4 : 23; 8 : 17; 9 : 35; 10 : 1, and by "infirmity" in Lk. 7 : 21.

² OEPKE, TWNT, IV, p. 1084.

³ ἀσθένεια; infirmitas. ἀσθένεια is translated by "infirmity" in Mt. 8 : 17; Lk. 5 : 15; 8 : 2; 13 : 11; 13 : 12; Jn. 5 : 5; 2 Co. 12 : 5; 12 : 9; Ga. 4 : 13; 1 Tim. 5 : 23, by "sickness" in Jn. 11 : 4, by "disease" in Ac. 28 : 9, and by "weakness" in 2 Co. 12 : 9; He. 11 : 34.

⁴ ἀσθενής; infirmus; in Ac. 5 : 16: aeger. ἀσθενής is translated by "sick" in Mt. 25 : 43; 25 : 44; Lk. 10 : 9; Ac. 5 : 15; 5 : 16, by "impotent" in Ac. 4 : 9 and by "weak" in 1 Co. 11 : 30.

⁵ ἀσθενέω. In the Latin translation we find infirmus, infirmitas or a form of the verb infirmare, except in Jn. 5 : 3 and 11 : 1, where languens appears, and Jn. 5 : 7 and Ac. 19 : 12, which have languidus. ἀσθενέω is translated by "sick" in Mt. 10 : 8; 25 : 36; 25 : 39; Mk. 6 : 56; Lk. 4 : 40; Jn. 4 : 46; 11 : 1; 11 : 3; 11 : 6; Ac. 9 : 37; 19 : 12; Phil. 2 : 26; 2 : 27; 2 Tim. 4 : 20; Jas. 5 : 14; by "impotent" in Jn. 5 : 3; 5 : 7, and by "diseased" in Jn. 6 : 2.

⁶ STÄHLIN, TWNT, I, p. 488 ff.; BAUER, Griech.-deu. Wörterbuch, ad loc.

In a number of texts the various shades of meaning of the concept find expression.¹

(c) Arroostos.² The meaning of arroostos is about the same as that of asthenes, viz. weak, bereft of strength.

(d) Malakia.³ This term occurs in Matthew only. Malakia means weakness, softness, both in the physical and in the mental sense; it points to a lack of vitality.⁴

(e) Mastix.⁵ Mastix really means horse-whip, which "passes over." Later it acquired the meaning of scourging, cf. Ac. 22 : 24, He. 11 : 36. In the figurative sense mastix means suffering, plague. Homer speaks of the "mastix of Zeus," i.e. the plague which Zeus sends, whilst Aeschylus speaks of the "divine plague."⁶ The Old Testament also speaks of the "rod of God."⁷ SCHNEIDER calls this word, used figuratively, the "most general collective name" for the diseases cured by Jesus.⁸ However, it is only used a few times.

The account in Mk. 5 points to a special plague, a kind of physical scourging. In our opinion mastix comes closest in meaning to "being afflicted," so that we prefer the translation "plague" or "scourge" to the colourless word "complaint" (Moffatt).

(f) Basanos.⁹ The original meaning of basanos is that of a tester of coins using a touchstone.¹⁰ This meaning entered economic life—in the sense of verifying something—and then spiritual life, in the sense of a means of testing. Just as the metal from which coins are made is tested to ensure that it is genuine, so man is also tested,

¹ Cf. for instance Mt. 26 : 41; Ac. 20 : 35; Ro. 14 : 1, 2; 1 Co. 1 : 25, 27; 4 : 10; 8 : 9-12; 9 : 22; 11 : 30; 2 Co. 12 : 9, 10; Ga. 4 : 9.

² ἄρρωστος, translated by "sick" in Mt. 14 : 14; Mk. 6 : 5, 13; 16 : 18; 1 Co. 11 : 30 (sickly). The Latin translation displays on this point a remarkable variation: Mt. 14 : 14 has languidus; Mk. 6 : 5 has infirmus; Mk. 6 : 13 and 16 : 18 have aeger; 1 Co. 11 : 30 has imbecilles.

³ μαλακία; infirmitas. Translated by "disease" in Mt. 4 : 23; 9 : 35; 10 : 1.

⁴ W. BAUER, op. cit., ad loc.

⁵ μάστιξ; plaga. Translated by "plague" in Mk. 3 : 10; 5 : 29, 34; Lk. 7 : 21.

⁶ SCHNEIDER, TWNT, IV, p. 521 ff. EITREM, op. cit., p. 29, is of the opinion that the original meaning of mastix has been weakened, cf. the separate mention of "plagues" and "evil spirits" or "unclean spirits" in Mk. 3 : 10, 11 and Lk. 7 : 21.

⁷ The "rod," שֵׁבֶט, is mentioned among other places in Job 9 : 34; 21 : 9. Isa. 11 : 4: "he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth." Cf. also the verbs for strike, hit, punish: Jer. 5 : 3 (נָכָה); 1 Sa. 6 : 9 (נָגַע).

⁸ SCHNEIDER, TWNT, IV, p. 525.

⁹ βασανός; tormentum, torment. See Mt. 4 : 24. In Mt. 8 : 6 the verb βασανίζω, torquere, is used.

¹⁰ SCHNEIDER, TWNT, I, p. 559 ff.

which may be done by means of torments and tortures, by means of "pain." This idea of testing and punishing going hand in hand is encountered in the Old Testament. In the New Testament, Lk. 16 : 23, 28, hell is described as the place of "torments" or "torment." The suffering of torment is also described in Mt. 14 : 24, Mk. 6 : 48. The disciples are in distress on the Sea of Galilee; their ship is "tossed with waves." Compared with Mt. 8 : 29, Mk. 5 : 7 and Lk. 8 : 28, where it is said of the devils that they undergo "torment" through the meeting with Jesus, the term "basanos" can best be translated as torment, painful trial.

(g) Kamnein. ¹ This term, meaning "being ill," occurs only once, namely in Jas. 5 : 15. The verb can also mean "being hopelessly ill." ² There is no reason to think of "dying;" in Classical Greek this merely means "being ill." ³

(h) Hoi kakoos echontes. ⁴ This is a very general description of a state of disease. The translation of Mt. 17 : 15, "he is... sore vexed," accurately reproduces the meaning. Kakos is evil, bad, disastrous, in various senses. ⁵

Our lexicological study opens a number of points of view. The various terms for "being ill" are found to express certain mental and physical emotional values. One feels weak and exhausted (asthenes, arroostos, malakia); one feels in a bad way (kakoos). From the psychological and somatic point of view, these terms displayed the same aspect then as they do today: a sick person says that he feels bad, miserable, weak, etc. Furthermore, some of the expressions display a certain religious aspect: one feels plagued, tormented afflicted (mastix), or one believes oneself tortured (basanos).

These terms provide little, if any, solid ground under the feet of doctors; they merely indicate a general state of disease. However,

¹ κάμνω; infirmus; sick.

² BAUER, Griech.-deu. Wörterbuch.

³ ROPES, St. James: "there is no reason whatever for taking τὸν κάμνοντα to mean 'the dying' (Von Soden)." See EDELSTEIN, Asclepius, I, p. 106. Choricus Gazaeus, III, 16, states: "Just as the skilled workmen of the sect of the Asclepiads visit the sick many times... (φοιτῶσι πολλάκις παρὰ τὸν κάμνοντα)."

⁴ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες; male habentes or with another verbal form, Mk. 1 : 34: "qui vexabantur variis languoribus." See Mt. 4 : 24 (that were taken with divers diseases); 8 : 16 (all that were sick); 9 : 12 (that are sick); 14 : 35 and Mk. 1 : 32 (all that were diseased); 17 : 15 (sore vexed); Mk. 1 : 34 (that were sick of divers diseases); Mk. 2 : 17 and Lk. 5 : 31 (they that are sick); Mk. 6 : 55 (those that were sick); Lk. 7 : 2 (was sick).

⁵ GRUNDMANN, TWNT, III, p. 470 ff.

we also encounter various diseases mentioned by name, and of all of these it is said that Jesus healed them. In this chapter we shall not go into details about the various medical opinions on the syndromes specifically mentioned, since we shall deal with these when discussing the healings of Jesus. We are concerned here with the broad outlines.

Even when reading the miraculous healings for the first time we are struck by the fact that the syndrome is nowhere described accurately. Not a single account says anything about the origin of the disease, the pathogenesis, whilst seldom is an anamnesis, the past history of the sick person and his disease, given. Occasionally we learn something about the length of the disease: Mt. 9 : 20, Jn. 5 : 5. The diseases are called by their most striking symptoms: fever, convulsions, dropsy, blindness, palsy, etc., but this does not tell us anything about their actual nature.

SENG says that the only disease of which the diagnosis can be taken as almost certain is that of the "lunatic" son in Mt. 17 : 14-21 and parallel passages, viz. epilepsy.¹

It is claimed that most of the diseases originate from disturbances of the nervous system, the normal functioning of certain organs thus being hampered: paralysis, blindness, deafness, dumbness, etc.² All kinds of examples are used to illustrate the occurrence of hysterical blindness, inability to express thought in words, or aphasia, and loss of voice, or aphonia, which we know for instance from wartime.³

FENNER goes so far as to describe all diseases of the New Testament, with the exception of a few obscure references, as one disease, viz. hysteria, or rather as "hysterical reactions," which he calls the "Proteus of disease."⁴ But FENNER is not a doctor, although he has made a thorough study of the New Testament diseases. We have already

¹ SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 11. EBSTEIN, op. cit., p. 67, says that it may be assumed "mit an Gewissheit grenzender Wahrscheinlichkeit" that this is epilepsy. Cf. HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 66, on the vagueness of ancient diagnosis.

² SENG, op. cit., passim; idem EBSTEIN. TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.*, p. 35: "Ausserordentlich interessant für die gesamte Beurteilung der Heilungen Jesu wirkt der psychiatrische Nachweis, dass mit diesem Krankheitsbild der hysterischen Neurose sehr häufig verbunden sind: Erblindungen, Lähmungen, Verlust des Gehörs und der Sprache" (p. 35).

³ SENG, op. cit., p. 19; FENNER, op. cit., p. 73; DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 291. MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 116: "In modern practice it is admitted that deafness and disabilities of speech are symptoms, which may be 'hysterical' in the sense of being initiated by suggestion, and curable by psychotherapy." HAGGARD, op. cit., p. 200 ff.

⁴ FENNER, op. cit., p. 74.

spoken of possession which, in the general medical opinion, is caused by natural defects.¹ EBSTEIN says that "it goes without saying from the medical point of view that it is not the demons and evil spirits which take action here, but the possessed persons."²

JANET is appreciative of those priests who treat the so-called possessed in a sensible fashion, but, says JANET, there are also foolish priests "who are silly enough to tell poor creatures tormented by godless obsessions a lot of nonsense about the Devil."³ It is remarkable that EBSTEIN, too, does not reject the possibility that madness rooted in neurasthenia and hysteria can be cured or at least controlled by laymen, such as mesmerists.⁴

The time of blunt materialism and rationalism, in which startling healings were ruthlessly cast overboard, is past. LIEK says that the wonderful cures of Jesus are completely comprehensible in the light of our present knowledge and find many a parallel in modern psychotherapy. And insofar as they seem to be in conflict with the laws of nature, for instance the resuscitation of the dead, it should not be forgotten, according to LIEK, "how quickly and to what extent legends form around every miracle-worker."⁵ Even to leprosy patients suggestion is often more beneficial than medicine.⁶ LIEK is of the opinion "that in the living organism there is no single disease, irrespective of whether we call it functional or organic, which is not to some extent accessible to mental influences."⁷

¹ VEDDER, *Inleiding tot de Psychiatrie*, p. 8, on belief in demons in Antiquity and the Middle Ages. "This belief in demons maintained itself for many centuries, thanks to the religious world of ideas of those days . . . Although the opinions quoted here belong to the past in the world of science, they can still be found today in popular medicine." Cf. HAMER, *Zielszorg en Psychiatrie*, p. 13 ff. KLOEK, *De verhouding van geloof en medische wetenschap*, p. 36 ff.

² EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

³ JANET, *Les obsessions et la psychasthénie*, p. 726. — JANET believes that the content of the "idée obsédante" does not come from outside, but that: "les obsessions psychasthéniques sortent bien plus qu'on ne le croit du fond même du sujet, que l'on peut les considérer comme endogènes, par opposition aux idées exogènes qui sont déterminées par le mécanisme de la suggestion." "L'obsession est le résultat d'un travail intellectuel qui s'opère pendant les crises de psycholepsie et qui remplit surtout les ruminations mentales" (p. 594 f.). Emotions also make themselves felt, especially religious and sexual ones (p. 602 ff.).

⁴ EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

⁵ LIEK, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

⁶ LIEK, *op. cit.*, p. 181 f.

⁷ LIEK, *op. cit.*, p. 182. HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 66 ff., points to the observations made by Petersen, a neurologist, at Lourdes. Petersen says that: "tatsächlich durch die religiöse Ekstase auch bei organischen

From the above we can draw the following conclusions from the medical standpoint:

- (a) The fact that the syndromes are hardly, if at all, described in the New Testament hampers a precise diagnosis.
- (b) The descriptions given in the New Testament allow of ascribing various cases to mental influences.
- (c) Similar cases from psychotherapy indicate that various of Jesus' healings lie within the limits of the medically possible.
- (d) Although it cannot be said for certain, it may be presumed that in various cases the diseases were of a chronic nature.¹
- (e) It is striking that many organic diseases, such as pulmonary diseases, diseases of the stomach, diphtheria, typhus, cancer, etc., are not mentioned, nor are fractures, sprains, etc.
- (f) The accounts of the resuscitation of the dead may either be explained as cases of suspended animation, or the account is "not open to medical discussion," as in the raising of Lazarus from the dead.²

But now a question arises which renders unstable all the auxiliary services—to put it that way—that medical science offers to exegesis, namely this. Do these medical opinions and pronouncements in fact make the healings of Jesus more acceptable; are, therefore, "miracles" really elucidated, or do the scientific buttresses instead prove inadequate when closely examined?

(d) *Approval and rejection*

Strangely enough, many theologians are filled with great gratitude towards the medical world, since they believe it to have contributed effectually to "salvaging" the healings of Jesus. This may be illustrated by a small selection of statements. "It is precisely the much maligned modern science that has proved that Jesus performed really remarkable healings," writes TRAUB, pointing out that the healing power of suggestion in certain nervous disturbances has medical backing, so that we can say, according to TRAUB, that all wonderful cures, insofar as they have their origin in hysteria, lose their miraculous character.³

Leiden wie Tuberkulose, und Lupus der Organismus in seinem Kampf gegen die Krankheit unterstützt werden kann, und zwar so, dass fast augenblickliche Heilung eintritt."

¹ EBSTEIN, op. cit., p. 50.

² SENG, op. cit., p. 22.

³ TRAUB, op. cit., p. 39.

E. WORCESTER and S. McCOMB, who jointly contributed a chapter to "Religion and Medicine" on the healings of Christ, are glad that nowadays we can smile at the rationalists who, in their sceptical dogmatism, would not accept miracles. A new medical light has been lit, and everyone knows how closely related soul and body are; we now know that hysteria and neurosis played a great part in Palestine, and we know the power of suggestion.¹ CAIRNS points out that the healings of Jesus now lie within the sphere of our knowledge,² whilst TENNANT remarks that "acts of healing mediated through the mind and the faith of the patient are recorded of our Lord, and have passed for miracles evidencing His divine nature; to-day such acts are commonly performed by faith-healers, agnostic as well as Christian. What was a miracle for the first generation of Christians is thus no miracle to us."³ MACKINNON is responsible for the pronouncement that God's will works "by adapting means to ends through the quickening of latent conditions or forces which are fitted to produce the desired result." This divine method "of adapting means to ends" is the secret of Jesus' healings. "It is an accepted maxim of modern medical science that the mind can work very remarkable effects on the body and achieve the cure of both physical and mental disease."⁴ "Modern medical science now acknowledges, and even emphasizes, the cure of disease by spiritual means."⁵ M. DIBELIUS recalls the wartime hysteria and points to the rapid cures of nervous disturbances and paralysis. "This so-called 'shock' therapy, with its influence on the will, with its rapid progress and its great success, has reminded others than theologians of the miracle stories from the life of Jesus." And DIBELIUS then believes that bearing in mind these surprising psychotherapeutical results, one may be "optimistic" about the "possibility" of Jesus' healings.⁶

It thus appears that many theologians, impressed by the results of

¹ WORCESTER-McCOMB-CORIAT, *Religion and Medicine*, p. 338 ff.

² CAIRNS, *The Faith that Rebels*, p. 39.

³ TENNANT, *Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions*, p. 31.

⁴ MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 351.

⁵ MACKINNON, *op. cit.*, p. 356.

⁶ M. DIBELIUS, *op. cit.*, p. 291; cf. further FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 20: "Prüft man die ntl. Aussagen über die Krankheit an den durch die ärztliche Wissenschaft gewonnenen Erkenntnissen und Erfahrungen, so ergibt sich, dass die im Urchristentum berichteten Krankheitserscheinungen unter ähnlichen Verhältnissen auch anderswo beobachtet worden sind, und dass auch die ihnen gegenüber angewandten Heilkräfte bis in die Gegenwart ihre Parallelen haben." RUPPRECHT, *Das Wunder in der Bibel*, p. 36. HEIM, *Zur Frage der Wunderheilungen*, p. 411.

modern medical science, have found a certain scientific support for accepting the healings of Jesus. But the question arises: is this in fact a support, or has a striking analogy "shocked" the senses?

To answer this question we must direct our attention towards three things: the sick and their diseases, the healing and the person of the healer.

Doubtless the confused situation in Palestine in the days of Jesus did not fail to have its effect on the minds of the people. All kinds of factors of a religious, political, social, economic and moral nature led to unbalance and lawlessness; they gave rise constantly to revolutionary outbursts and caused the people to long for deliverance and a Redeemer (remember the stir that followed on the appearances of John the Baptist and of Jesus).

The possibility therefore presents itself that many of the sick with whom Jesus came into contact were mentally ill (the possessed were, in any case), and their physical ills such as paralysis, deafness, etc., could be attributed to disturbances of the nervous system. Yet there are too many and too serious drawbacks to generalization, which arise from the accounts in the Gospels themselves. At various places the Gospels say that "all that were sick" were brought to Jesus (for the references see above). Reference is made without any further indication to the lame, blind and deaf, to lepers, etc. Can all these be classified without distinction under the mentally ill?

It is precisely the hesitant and cautious opinions of the doctors themselves, and their weighing of various possibilities, that should warn the theologian to be cautious. This may be illustrated by a number of examples. EBSTEIN says that with regard to the woman who suffered from an issue of blood, the spirit of the disease might mean attendant "mental symptoms."¹ As regards the palsy, or paralysis, EBSTEIN does not know what exactly is meant by "palsy" in the New Testament. Too little is known about the nature of the paralysis to make an exact scientific diagnosis possible.² The same applies to the blindness, deafness and dumbness. These diseases may have had all kinds of causes. "As long as we do not have available more accurate material on the healing of the blind, deaf and dumb in the New Testament, or on the nature of their diseases, it is impossible from the medical point of view to give an expert opinion on these cases,"

¹ EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

² EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 79 f.

says EBSTEIN.¹ Very little indeed can be said about leprosy, particularly since it is not known what form of leprosy is meant in the New Testament. We also encounter the same caution in SENG. With regard to Mk. 3 : 1, the healing of the man with the withered hand, he remarks that, medically speaking, we shall be inclined here, too, to think of the healing of a case with a mental cause.² He further states that there is still a considerable difference of opinion about blindness resulting from mental causes; in any case this does not often happen. On the other hand, loss of speech is a frequent symptom of mental disturbances.³

Against the background of this cautious approach to the diseases of the New Testament, it is strange to see a theologian such as FENNER depositing all diseases in the receptacle of hysteria, by which, following in the footsteps of Gaupps, he understands: "an abnormal manner of reacting to the demands of life," coming from the subterranean depths of the psyche's passions.⁴ FENNER, however, tones down his conclusions several times by saying that "probably" this is a case of hysteria.⁵

Doubtless modern medical science has cast a new, or rather a different, light on the healings of Jesus, and partly through its instrumentality the aureole of sceptical materialism has faded. There are certainly striking points of similarity between various healings of Jesus and cases from psychotherapy. That the mind of the sick, both in functional and organic disease, when influenced by a doctor, a pastor, a mesmerist, a miracle-healer, plays an important function

¹ EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 83. He says the following about sudden blindness: "Dass es übrigens vorübergehende schwere Sehstörungen gibt, imfolge deren die betreffenden Individuen nichts sehen und ganz plötzlich vorübergehend 'erblinden,' ohne dass irgendwelche krankhafte Veränderung an ihrem Auge selbst bei Zuhilfenahme der feinsten Untersuchungsmethoden sichtbar ist, darf angenommen werden" (p. 84). He reports two cases of sudden blindness and believes that such cases throw some light on the cases in the N.T.

² SENG, *op. cit.*, p. 17. However: "Im neuen Testament (Mk 3, 1) steht nichts über die Entstehung des Zustandes, so wenig wie in allen anderen Fällen" (p. 17).

³ SENG, *op. cit.*, p. 19.

⁴ FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 44. "Die Psychotherapie, die als Heilmethode im N.T. anzunehmen ist, wird ihre Hauptaufgabe immer in der Behandlung psychisch-nervöser Zustände finden. Alle auf dem Boden der Hysterie erwachsenen psychischen Störungen sind ihr zugänglich. Für die Heilung der 'Besessenen' kommt sie allein in betracht" (p. 98).

⁵ FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 106. FENNER says that he remains aware: "dass in einer Untersuchung über die Krankheit im N.T. für den Historiker nur bis zu Wahrscheinlichkeiten vorzudringen möglich ist."

in healing is something that nobody will now be prepared to deny.¹ The mental and the somatic do not, after all, form two separate regions. Disease is not a disturbance of part of the organism, "but an adjustment disturbance of the organism in its totality."²

In the discussion between medical and theological science on the miracles of Jesus the following must be borne closely in mind. Here, as in many other fields, the danger threatens that in one way or the other parallel lines are bent towards one another and made to merge. Forms resembling one another are combined into one entity; in our case, it is believed that in the methods and results of psychotherapy certain "evidence" can be found for Jesus' healings.

We are of the opinion that this is not the case at all. It seems to us that anyone who carefully studies the healings in the Gospels can hardly derive the impression that Jesus went to work as a doctor, a psychiatrist. Nowhere is there any mention of the anamnesis or the nature of the disease; nowhere do we find traces of a psychoanalytical treatment; apart from the odd exception, there was only the redeeming word of Jesus. Jesus did not prescribe anything; He did not make any further appointments with His patients, but the cure was instantaneous and radical.

Terms such as hysteria, psychosis, neurosis, psychotherapy, hypnosis, suggestion, etc., seem to possess a mysterious magnetic force which induces their use as material to explain the healings of Jesus, especially those of the possessed and of the multitude (mass suggestion!).

¹ HEIM, op. cit., p. 411: "Durch eine Menge von Erfahrungen auf dem Gebiet der Medizin und der sogenannten Glaubensheilungen ist immer deutlicher geworden: es kommt vor, dass nicht etwa nur nervöse, sondern organische Veränderungen im Menschen nicht nur durch Behandlung von aussen (Medikamente, Bäder, Operationen usw) herbeigeführt werden, sondern durch unmittelbare Willensbeeinflussung auf geistigem Wege." As a joint form Heim sees both a negative element, viz. external means are not used, and a positive one, viz. an invisible force becomes active. Both patient and healer must believe in this force. Cf. CAIRNS, op. cit., p. 158. WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, op. cit., p. 50, quote a pronouncement by A. T. Schofield, a doctor: "When the eye of the patient meets the eye of the physician the cure begins if it is likely to take place."

² DU BOEUFF and KUIPER, *Psychotherapie en zielszorg*, p. 21: "The development of medical science in recent years has demonstrated that mental and somatic disturbances cannot be isolated from one another." The mental and the somatic must be regarded "as aspects of the one undivided human existence." Cf. FABER, *Over ziek zijn*, p. 30 f. ELZINGA, *Geloof en Geneeskunde*, makes the valuable comment that psychosomatic medicine does not imply "that medicine has therefore come more closely into contact with the Christian faith" (p. 11) . . . Modern medicine no more opens the gate to the Christian faith than modern physics does.

At first sight the similarities do in fact appear most surprising, as already stated; but when they are studied more closely one difficulty after the other crops up, and when the "vital parts" of the Gospels are reached, the material proves to be absolutely inadequate. We have in any case already seen that the effect of medical science's explanations of most of the healings was often immediately tempered with a "probably" and "the reports are too inaccurate for an exact diagnosis."¹

If we assume for a moment that somewhere there is a completely analogous case, that might mean that in this case the healing of Jesus would lose its nature of a "miracle." What was reported as a miracle a few hundred years ago would no longer be one, and the way which TENNANT sees opened when he says: "Some gospelmiracles are already resolvable into naturally explicable phenomena, and others may yet be resolved"² would in fact be opened! We are, however, of the opinion that this way has not been opened in the least, nor will it be, because the "vital parts" of the Bible oppose this; because the whole of the witness in the New Testament, not that in Jesus Christ a highly skilled psychotherapist appeared, but that in Him God came to man, is not in the least reconcilable with this conception.

This brings us to the third point, the person of the healer. If analogies are to be seen, they must fit in all respects, i.e. the person of the healer must also be involved in this analogy. We have already drawn attention to the view of the supporters of the school of comparative religion, in which Jesus is regarded as a kind

¹ How difficult it is to make an exact diagnosis on the basis of the scanty empirical medical reports from Antiquity is illustrated by the attempt made by DE LEEUW to establish Aristides' disease. Aristides lists an impressive series of ills from which he has suffered: fever, pain, sweating, insomnia, palpitations, catarrh, skin complaints, etc. Aristides describes the diseases as he experiences them. DE LEEUW concludes that Aristides was suffering from a hysterio-neurotic form of reaction; see *op. cit.*, p. 134 ff. BAUMANN, *Psyche's lijden*, p. 52, calls Aristides "the most celebrated hypochondriac of Antiquity," a neurotic and superstitious man, a real psychopath . . . At the same time it should be pointed out that the field of psychiatry is inaccessible to the non-specialist, and the differences of opinion between the experts themselves, for instance on the concept "neurosis," should warn the layman to be doubly cautious! See VEDDER, *op. cit.*, p. 119 ff. Cf. also RÜMKE, *Studies en voordrachten over psychiatrie*; FABER, *Over ziek zijn*, p. 86, GÖDAN, *Christus u. Hippokrates*, p. 57 ff.

² TENNANT, *op. cit.*, p. 94. Tennant judges as follows: "Christianity does not presuppose the Christian miracles; they presuppose Christianity, though they are by no means bound up with Christianity. If signs and wonders actually occurred in connection with its foundation, they are of little significance for theology in our time."

of thaumaturge. The situation is the same when Jesus is placed among the ranks of the therapists who treat the sick by mental means. If this were so, the method of analogy would in fact be the only correct one. For that reason we also consider the view of CAIRNS questionable. CAIRNS says that many believe that the glory of Jesus' miracles fades when they are compared with Lourdes, Christian Science, mental techniques of healing and psychotherapy. "There is a profound difference between the deeds of Jesus taken as a whole and the miracles of Lourdes and Nancy, but so far as physical results go it is a difference of degree rather than of kind. I would plead for a more sympathetic outlook on all these strange phenomena of spiritual and mental healing. If they can be finally established as true facts, the result would be greatly to enrich human life and widen and deepen our whole view of the world."¹ However, the issue is not more or less sympathy for the "wonderful cures" (which are not considered in this chapter) or for the results of modern psychiatry, but the cardinal question: can and may the miracles of Jesus be regarded as *human* action, that is to say as the result of the influence of one human mind on the other, so that the latter itself has a salutary effect on the functions of the body, or is something quite different involved in the healings of Jesus? CAIRNS' notion that people would believe the person of Jesus to have been degraded, as it were, if various of His deeds could be explained in a natural way is really rather naive.² MICKLEM is more cautious in what he says. He has an open mind for the results of modern psychotherapy and in his book he mentions all kinds of examples from medical practice; he too is of the opinion that psychotherapy makes a considerable contribution towards an understanding of the healings in the New Testament,

¹ CAIRNS, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

² CAIRNS, *op. cit.*, p. 162. "Many good people today think that it lowers the greatness of the miracles of Jesus to seek to bring them into any kind of comparison with Lourdes and Christian Science and Spiritual healing and Psychotherapeutics" . . . Cf. TENHAEFF, *Magnetiseurs, Somnambules en Gebedsgenezers*, p. 251 f. Tenhaeff puts all "miraculous healings" on the same level: those of Jesus, of Lourdes, of the Christian Scientists, of Möttlingen, of mesmerists, etc. But the "relationship" which Tenhaeff believes that he can find just is not there! ZORAB, *Magnetiseurs en Wondergenezers*, p. 103 ff., challenges Lourdes' sole rights. "Nor can it be maintained that Christian saints or divine persons worshipped by the Christians possess the sole right to have performed (miraculous) healings." According to Zorab, the "religious healing method" is "of eminent importance to suffering mankind," but the "metaphysical explanation" is the "weak point!"

but that it still does not give us "a complete explanation of them."¹

If, nevertheless, theology may be grateful to modern medical science for its experiences, its methods and results, this is in our opinion not because the healings of Jesus have in fact been "scientifically" explained and anchored, but because medical science in its way has demonstrated scientifically that the theories of the rationalistic and materialistic outlook on life and those of mechanistic biology are errors.

¹ MICKLEM, *op. cit.*, p. 136. G. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, p. 38, will not think of comparing Jesus with great physicians or other gifted persons. He points to the absolutely unique nature of Jesus' deeds of salvation as signs of the redeeming action of God. "The Gospels speak of the great work of salvation, which cannot be psychologically dissected and made explicable. And therefore it is in the nature of the subject-matter of the Gospels that all kinds of questions regarding hypnosis, suggestion, etc., must lead to entirely unfruitful and often misleading speculation."

PART TWO

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

INTRODUCTION

I. TYPE AND STYLE OF THE MIRACLE STORIES IN THE GOSPELS

Before we can discuss the miraculous power and the miraculous feats of Jesus, two problems must be examined more closely. The first problem is that of the form in which the miracle stories of the New Testament are cast. We must examine by comparison whether and to what extent other miracle stories might have influenced those of the New Testament. The second problem requires an investigation into possible practices of Jewish miracle-workers at the time of Jesus. Were there rabbis in those days who performed miracles and, if so, what was the nature of these miracles and what was their relation to the miracles of Jesus?

The answer to both questions is of great importance in explaining and understanding Jesus' miracles.

The first problem that concerns us is therefore that of the type and the style of the miracle stories.

(a) *Aretalogy*

In those countries which are closely linked together by political, economic and cultural factors, contacts in the religious field will also manifest themselves, with far-reaching results. We need only point to Hellenistic syncretism and to the Pantheon in Rome as the religio-political fruit of the Pax Romana. Now Palestine was a small outpost of the mighty Roman Empire. Would the first Christians, despite their vigorous opposition to foreign influences, have been capable of isolating their spiritual life and safeguarding themselves against every pagan taint? And would the literary products of the new religion likewise have been able to preserve intact an independence of vocabulary and choice of words, particularly in the accounts of miracles? These questions are still a subject of study in New Testament science, and they are of the greatest importance to our investigation as well. The problem amounts to the following: do the accounts of miracles in the New Testament and the pagan miracle stories resemble one another so closely that the conclusion must be reached that there is not only analogy of form but also a real dependence? Many answer this question in the affirmative. They believe that the accounts of

miracles in the New Testament should be seen in the light of a certain literary genre, aretalogy. This literary form was common in the ancient world. The word aretalogy is derived from the Greek word *aretē*, meaning virtue, the greatest good, excellence, fame, distinction.¹ Later the concept *aretē* easily merged in meaning with that of *dynamis*, meaning power, miraculous power.² For the virtue of the divinity or of the "divine man" was impressively illustrated by a display of miraculous power. His virtues and deeds had to be proclaimed and celebrated for the purpose of edifying the readers and pleasantly occupying their minds, but at the same time in order to spread the fame of the one concerned. In aretalogy the narrator is not the strict historian, who must adhere to the facts and the truth, but the poet, who is permitted to tell of myths and miracles which combine instruction with entertainment.³ REITZENSTEIN was the first to draw attention to an important note in the Juvenal palimpsest of Bobbio, in which we encounter the only ancient definition of aretalogy. "Arithologi are, in the eyes of some, [people] who tell of wonderful things, i.e. the virtues of the gods. But it seems to me that those who publish those things that are not invented should be called arithologi."⁴ In this definition a favourable opinion is thus given of the aretalogist. But, according to a gloss, the following also appeared in the middle: "aretalogist, i.e. a falsifier, a liar, a mountebank."⁵ This reveals that the aretalogist could also have

¹ KIEFER, *Aretalogische Studien*, p. 2, points to Jesus Sirach 36 : 17: "Fill Zion with your Majesty (aretalogia) and your people with your fame." "Dies ist das erste Auftreten des Wortes für uns." Aretalogy thus has an elevated meaning here . . . The etymology of aretalogy is uncertain. "Dem kultischen Terminus liegt Herleitung von ἀρετή zugrunde, sei das nun das Ursprüngliche oder sei es volksetymologischer Deutung zu verdanken. Der Aretaloge ist im Kult der Inhaber eines heiligen Amtes" (p. 18). *Aretē* is not identical with "miracle," as S. Reinach thinks. Cf. BAUERNFEIND, TWNT, I, p. 459. SÖDER, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten*, p. 51 ff.

² KIEFER, *op. cit.*, p. 19. Cf. HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 46 ff.

³ See REITZENSTEIN, *Hellen. Wundererzählungen*, p. 2.

⁴ REITZENSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 8: "Arithologi sunt, ut quidam volunt, qui miras res, id est deorum virtutes loquuntur. Mihi autem videtur arithologus illos dici, qui ea quae ficta a) non sunt, in vulgus proferunt."

a) The codex does not contain *ficta*, but *dicta*, which has been changed by Reitzenstein.

⁵ REITZENSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 8: "Aretalogus: falsidicus, mendax, artificiosus." See KIEFER, *op. cit.*, p. 6, who has "*dicta*" (see note 4). In a satire on the Egyptian religion, Juvenal (satire 15, 13 f.) says: "ut mendax aretalogus," i.e. "the aretalogist is a liar" (KIEFER, p. 5).

a bad reputation. A distinction must be made between two kinds of aretalogy, viz. the religious type, which is closely bound up with worship and served for missionary purposes, and the profane type, which was meant as light reading. The first category includes for instance the tales of the deeds performed by the benevolent gods Serapis and Aesculapius; the second includes the *Philopseudes* of Lucianus, discussed earlier, Petronius' *Satirae*, etc. KIEFER believes that the profane aretalogy is older than the religious form, the cultic.¹ According to REITZENSTEIN the oldest religious aretalogy that we know outside Egypt is the book of Jonah.² REITZENSTEIN argues that in the three great periods of the old Christian miracle stories, viz. that of the Gospels with later the Acts of the Apostles, that of the Apocryphal Acts and finally that of the monks' stories, we encounter the same literary connection with Hellenistic literature. "It provides the literary framework; it gives the method of polemics which alters the picture by apparent additions or slight changes; finally, it supplies the separate examples, which are taken over as they are."³ And everywhere, says REITZENSTEIN, we are confronted with the same riddle that Lucianus tried to solve, namely why serious, truly religious persons deliberately distort the truth, without realizing that they are doing so! The view that a miracle is a "virtue of God" urges and compels them to tell of "miracles of God." They wish to uplift, to build up the ranks of the believers; their highest aspiration is psychagogy, guidance of the soul.⁴

There is consequently a school of thought that wishes to place the miracle stories of the New Testament in this genre as well: the virtues and miracles of the "divine man" Jesus are described for the purpose of glorifying Him and making Him known to wide circles.

Now it can hardly be denied that the accounts of miracles in the New Testament have much in common with the pagan stories of miracles, both in material and in form. But surely this is entirely

¹ KIEFER, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

² REITZENSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

³ REITZENSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 82 f. Cf. SCHNEIDER, *Einführung i.d. Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, par. 8; HENNECKE, *Neutestam. Apokr.*, p. 163 ff. SCHNEIDER, *Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums*, II, p. 41 ff.: "Erbauungs- und Unterhaltungsliteratur."

⁴ REITZENSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 83. Cf. BIELER, *op. cit.*, The "divine man" is humane. He also acts as: "milde Helfer in kleinen und grössen Nöten des täglichen Lebens" (p. 111).

self-evident? The more miracle stories one reads, the more one is struck by the fact that the same features appear again and again in these stories, though in all kinds of variations. Since the same laws of nature apply all over the world, the miracle-worker all over the world will display his power in victories over the elements: he will still storms, walk on water, cause springs to gush forth, make rain, etc. He will drive out disease and restore the dead to life. The stories will thus have the same content. The miracle-worker will try to display his power as effectively as possible; the results will therefore have to show "immediately." The reactions of those concerned and interested will be admiration, surprise, dismay, acclamation, but also scepticism and derision. In every miracle story we find these features; there is a certain narrative style. The pattern of the miracle story is therefore *not* primarily the product of a certain kind of literature, but the narrative style is the logical literary consequence of a certain situation. That is to say, it is not the form that creates the situation, but the situation that determines the form! We need not consider here the question of the factuality of the miracle reported; all we are concerned with is: how did the story acquire this form? And what we mean is not that the form is the predominant principle and criterion, but that one must seek behind the form the religious, historical and psychological backgrounds and motives of the stories so as to arrive at the most exact possible analysis and judgment. Doubtless it will then be found that many miracle stories can be reduced to literary dependence, but one will not allow oneself to be governed a priori by the sovereignty of the form, nor conclude from a certain similarity of subject-matter that material has been borrowed.

(b) In our investigation of the "*typical*" features of the miracle stories of the Gospels we shall keep the above clearly in mind.

1. *Nature, seriousness and duration of the diseases* referred to in the Gospels. There was no question of proper diagnosis, so that the diseases were designated by their symptoms: blindness, palsy, fever, deafness, etc.¹ Often reference is made to the seriousness of the disease: Mk. 5 : 3-5; 9 : 18-22. Compare this with the story of the possessed lad who was cured by Apollonius.² Mention is frequently made of

¹ Compare the list of Aristides' diseases which Aesculapius is said to have cured; DE LEEUW, Aelius Aristides, p. 135. See also the description of Herod's illness, FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, XVII, VI, 5.

² VITA APOLL., IV, 20: "... but when Apollonius looked steadfastly at him

the long duration of the illness: Mt. 9 : 20 (twelve years); Mk. 9 : 21 ("of a child"); Lk. 13 : 11 (eighteen years); Jn. 5 : 5 ("an infirmity thirty and eight years"); Jn. 9 : 1 ("from his birth"); Ac. 3 : 2 and 14 : 8 ("from his mother's womb"); Ac. 9 : 33 ("had kept his bed eight years"). A mother was once brought to Apollonius seeking aid for her sixteen-year-old son "who she said had been possessed by a demon for two years, its special manifestation being in his cheating and lying."¹ Now BULTMANN calls descriptions such as this, and also those which will be discussed later, characteristic of the exposition of the miracle story.² This is quite true, but even so one must realize that this implies nothing about possible historical backgrounds. In daily life the nature, seriousness and duration of illnesses are also regularly stated. It is for this reason that we object to BULTMANN's remark that the seriousness of the illness is portrayed "to put the Saviour's deed in the right light," since the peg on which to hang these words simply is not there.³

2. *The failure of official medicine.* In Mk. 5 : 26 the failure of the doctors is clearly portrayed. A woman who had been ill for twelve years had grown worse rather than better from medical treatment. This case is reminiscent of the experience of Aristides, who had consulted various doctors to no avail and who had finally had recourse to the temple of Aesculapius at Pergamum. He makes no secret of the fact that doctors are unreliable, and even says: "Although afflicted in the body, we did not resort to imploring the aid of doctors, which is an unworthy act, but, although we numbered the best of doctors among our friends, we fled to the temple of Aesculapius."⁴

Here, too, we have a normal situation: it is a common occurrence

the demon uttered loud shrieks of fear and wrath, like those who are burned or tortured" (transl. Eells).

LUCIANUS, *Philops.*, 16, speaks of the Syrian from Palestine who heals "many epileptics who fall down, roll their eyes and have a mouth full of foam," and lets them go after payment of a substantial fee.

¹ VITA APOLL., III, 38 . . . BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 236, also points to examples from Neugriech. Märchen, edited by P. Kretschmer, 1917.

² BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

³ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

⁴ DE LEEUW, *Aelius Aristides*, p. 73 f. Aristides calls Aesculapius: "the true doctor, meet for him" (p. 74) . . . Marinus, *Vita Procli*, Ch. 29, tells how a certain Asclepigenia "was stricken with a grievous illness, which the physicians were unable to cure." In answer to the prayers of the philosopher Proclus the girl was healed forthwith by Aesculapius. See EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, p. 322 f.

that a chronically sick person whom official medicine cannot aid seeks relief outside medical science.

3. *Ridiculing the miracle-worker.* Mk. 5 : 40 tells us how Jesus was laughed to scorn when He said that the daughter of Jairus was not dead, but sleeping. Apollonius was laughed at by a possessed lad.¹ In the miracle stories of Epidaurus reference is several times made to doubt about the cures of Aesculapius, and the god is mocked at.² Frequently the ridicule was of an innocent nature. "But often the derision is prompted by malice; the religious prophet in particular is subjected to an abundance of it by unbelievers."³ This urge to doubt and mock is wholly explicable: at all times a person who says unusual things and performs startling deeds runs the risk of being attacked and laughed at.

4. *The difficulty of healing.* According to BULTMANN the difficulty of healing is also one of the aspects that dominate the exposition of the story. He quotes as examples the healings of Emperor Vespasian and, as regards the New Testament, the healing of the deaf man, Mk. 7 : 33, and of the blind man at Bethsaida, Mk. 8 : 23, for which special manipulations were required.⁴ BULTMANN finds it strange that this feature occurs so infrequently in the New Testament, while we often encounter it in the Hellenistic miracle stories.⁵

¹ VITA APOLL., IV, 20. Apollonius says: "That insult does not come from you, but from the demon which possesses you, without your knowing it."

² HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*.

A man mocked at the inscriptions about the healings (p. 9).

A one-eyed woman mocked at the healings (p. 11).

Cf. BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 236. See the note on the resurrection of Jairus' daughter.

³ BIELER, *op. cit.*, I, p. 132. Bieler points to a passage in Iamblichus 178, in which someone mocks at Pythagoras' doctrine on the return of souls and says: "When you go to Hades, take with you a letter to my father, and when you return bring his answer." See also Mt. 26 : 67 f.; Mt. 27 : 27 ff.; Mt. 27 : 39 f. The *Actus Vercellenses*, cap. 11, states that a possessed lad laughed at Peter; see HENNECKE, *Neutestam. Apokr.*, p. 238. TROELS LUND, *Gesundheit u. Krankheit*, p. 153, tells how the wonder doctor Paracelsus was laughed at and forgotten by poor people whom he had healed. "Aber Geistliche und Ärzte stellten ein Kesseltreiben gegen ihn an, verschrien ihn als einen 'Luther' und einen Lumpen ohne Doktorhut. Dann kam es zu Disputationen, in denen sie auf Latein schrien, er auf Deutsch antwortete und Hohnworte den Ausschlag gaben."

⁴ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 237. Cf. DREWS, *Die Christusmythe*, p. 179.

⁵ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 237. See FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, VIII, II, 5: the Jewish miracle-worker Eleazar pulls a demon out through the nose of a demoniac, using a ring. LUCIANUS, *Philops.*, 11: a piece of tombstone was bound to an inflamed foot, etc.

In order to demonstrate how greatly Jesus' healings differ from those of Vespasian, the account of the latter's cures follows in extenso. "During those months in which Vespasian waited at Alexandria for days with summer winds and a calm sea, many miracles occurred, which was a mark of heavenly favour and of a certain affection of the gods towards Vespasian. One of the common folk of Alexandria, known for his blindness, flung himself down before his knees, begging and sighing for a cure for his blindness, on the advice of the god Serapis, whom the superstitious people revere above the other [gods], and he begged the emperor to deign to moisten his cheeks and his eyeholes with his spittle; another, with a sick hand, begged the emperor on the advice of the same god to tread on him with his foot. At first Vespasian turned away, laughing, but when they persisted he now feared the rumour that a failure would cause, and then was encouraged by their pleas and the voices of the coaxers; finally he commanded that physicians should examine whether such blindness and impotence could be cured by human effort. After lengthy consultations, the physicians judged that the power of sight of the one had not been destroyed and would return when the impediments were dislodged, and that the crooked limbs of the other could be restored if beneficial power were applied; this was perhaps after the heart of the gods and the emperor had been chosen as the divine instrument; finally, if the cure were successful the fame thereof would accrue to the emperor, whereas if it failed scorn would be the lot of the unfortunate couple. And so Vespasian, with a glad countenance, and believing that all was open to his fortune and nothing more was unbelievable, complied with the urgent prayers, while the crowd standing by watched with rapt attention: at once the hand could be used again and the daylight shone again for the blind man. Those who were there tell of both cases even now, since a lie is of no value."¹ The difference between the attitude of Vespasian, who laughed, refused, feared, was encouraged, commanded a prior medical examination, etc., and that of Jesus is so obvious that one can hardly speak of a parallel here.

5. *The encounter between miracle-worker and the patient.* The miracle-worker approaches the sick person in various ways. When healing Peter's mother-in-law, Jesus went and stood over her, Lk. 4 : 39. Aesculapius cured the Attic comedian Theopompos "by approaching

¹ TACITUS, Hist., IV, 81 (text edited by J. W. P. BORLEFFS, Zwolle, 1947).

the sick man's bed and holding out to him his healing hand." ¹ When the famous Syrian miracle-worker from Palestine, healer of many epileptics, saw these victims lying there, "he approached them where they lay and asked whence (the spirits) had entered their bodies." ² According to BULTMANN this is a traditional feature, which we also find in the encounter with the funeral procession, cf. Lk. 7 : 11, the meeting of Jesus with the young man at Nain. Apollonius once happened upon a funeral procession in Rome; a bride, a member of a prominent family, had died and was being borne to her grave on her bier. Apollonius had the procession stopped and raised the bride from the dead "by merely touching the body and murmuring a few words over her." ³ The form can only be understood here from the situation. One can hardly come into contact with the dead other than by visiting a deathbed, Mt. 9 : 23-26, meeting a funeral procession, Lk. 7 : 11, or visiting a grave, Jn. 11.

6. *The treatment of the sick.* The chapter on the methods of treatment used by Jesus will deal extensively with therapeutical analogies—touching the sick, speaking authoritative words, various remedies, etc. It may be mentioned here that the stimulating words with which Jesus addressed the sick, viz. "be of good cheer," also occur elsewhere. ⁴ Apollonius several times exhorted downcast persons to be of "good cheer." ⁵ This expression also occurs frequently in the Old Testament. ⁶ This is nothing more than the ordinary attempt to put new heart into someone in need, which was also used frequently by Jesus. ⁷

¹ WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. 1. Here Aesculapius is represented as the saviour on earth; see the Theopompos relief.

² LUCIANUS, *Philops.*, 16.

³ VITA APOLL., IV, 45. Cf. WEINREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 171 ff. BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 237.

⁴ Mt. 9 : 2; 9 : 22 (be of good comfort); 14 : 27; Mk. 6 : 50. Cf. Mk. 10 : 49 (be of good comfort); Jn. 16 : 33; Ac. 23 : 11.

⁵ VITA APOLL. An Indian wise man tells a mother whose son is possessed to be of "good cheer" (θάρσει, ἔφη ὁ σοφός), III, 38 . . . Apoll. calls out to the Ephesians, who have been afflicted by a severe plague: "Be of good courage, for I shall put a stop to the disease today" (θαρσεῖτε, ἔφη, τήμερον πάλσω τὴν νόσον), IV, 10 . . . "But Apollonius said 'Be of good courage; for the sea has brought forth land'" (ὁ δὲ Ἀπολλώνιος, θαρσεῖτε, ἔφη ἡ γὰρ θάλαττα γῆν ἔτεκε), IV, 34.

⁶ Cf. "Be strong and of a good courage" in Deu. 31 : 6, 7, 23; Jos. 1 : 6, 7, 9, 18; see also 1 Ch. 22 : 13; 28 : 20; 2 Ch. 32 : 7.

⁷ GRUNDMANN, *TWNT*, III, 25 ff.: "Dieser Aufruf zeigt in voller Lebendigkeit, wie sich in der Christusbegegnung der Menschen das Handeln Gottes als befreiendes Handeln vollzieht. Jesu Evangelium, das sowohl in seinem Verkünden wie in seinem Handeln besteht, schafft Freude und Zuversicht und treibt Lebens-

7. *Proof of the reality of the cure.* In various ways it is demonstrated that a cure was in fact effected, as by ministering, Mk. 1 : 31; showing oneself to the priest, Mk. 1 : 44; taking up the bed, Mk. 2 : 12, Lk. 5 : 25, Jn. 5 : 9; eating, Mk. 5 : 43.

As regards taking up the bed, we find a remarkable parallel in Lucianus. A certain Ion tells how a strong gardener's lad, called Midas, was bitten in the big toe by an adder. His fellow-workers bore away the victim, who was in a pitiful state, on a bed. A Babylonian who happened to be in the vicinity pronounced a magic spell, whilst healing was furthered by binding a piece of a special tombstone to Midas' foot. Ion then goes on to say: "Perhaps that is considered quite normal, although Midas himself took up the bed on which he had been carried and hurried to the estate."¹

FIEBIG points out how the history of this "typical feature" of the taking up of a bed has developed. In 1906 REITZENSTEIN spoke of a "typical form." In 1909 WEINREICH said the same thing: it is a typical formula.² In 1921 BULTMANN wrote of a demonstration, which had to show "the reality of the cure",³ whilst KLOSTERMANN speaks in 1936 of a "typical conclusion" and a "feat of strength" as a proof of complete healing.⁴ Like Bultmann, he refers to a miraculous cure by Aesculapius at Epidaurus. "Hermodicus of Lampsacus, physically paralysed. He cured him by incubation and commanded him as he left to carry into the temple a stone, the largest he could lift. The man brought it, and now it lies in front of the temple." Now in 1911 FIEBIG wisely wrote that there is after all a difference in the accounts. Midas did not receive the command to take up his bed, whereas the man sick of the palsy in Mk. 2 : 11 did. FIEBIG goes on to argue that when

angst und Lebensnot aus, indem er die Menschen in die Güte Gottes, den er Vater heisst, hineinzieht."

¹ LUCIANUS, *Philops.*, 11. For "bed" we find here *σκήπτους*, which according to FIEBIG is a narrow bedstead. The New Testament has *κράβατος*, *κράβατος*, which according to W. BAUER, *Griech.-deu. Wörterbuch*, is the bed of "the little man." The word is of unknown origin, see BLASS-DEBRUNNER, *Neutest. Gramm.*, § 42.

² WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. 174: "Sie scheint mir eine steigende Weiterbildung des Motivs zu sein, dass der Kranke auf einem Bett, einer Bahre gebracht wird, nach erfolgter Wunderheilung nach Hause *geben* kann."

³ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, in the 1921 edition on p. 142; in the 1957 edition on p. 240.

⁴ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*. BAUER, *Das Johannesevangelium*, re Jn. 5 : 9: "Es gehört zum Typus der Wundergeschichte, dass der Geheilte zum augenfälligen Erweis des geschehenen Wunders das Bett, auf dem er bisher gelegen, von dannen trägt."

it is said that the healed paralytic could walk, this is just as natural as when it is said of a healed blind man that he can see. "The fact that the healed person takes with him his bed, which obviously could be easily carried, when he is cured is just as natural as a cured paralytic walking or a healed blind man seeing." FIEBIG therefore cannot see what is "typical" about this feature, and thus he does not see any grounds for suspecting the story of the paralytic because of this.¹ By holding this view, FIEBIG gives evidence of having a sound, matter-of-fact view of the situation. Taking up the bed has nothing in common with a feat of strength such as the man with the stone had to perform, but is explained by natural circumstances.

8. It is often remarked that *the word "immediately"* forms part of the style of miracle stories.² It occurs several times in pagan miracle literature.³ In the accounts of the cures of Lourdes stress is laid on the immediate occurrence, or at least the very rapid process, of the cures.⁴ In practically every story of a faith healing we are told that the sick person recovered "at once." To arrive at a correct idea of the use of the word "immediately" in the Gospels, it will have to be borne in mind that this term is used not only in the accounts of miracles, but also elsewhere. Mark uses the word most, which in the opinion of DALMAN is the result of the author's personal inclination, and is probably less Palestinian Aramaic than Greek.⁵

¹ FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 91 ff.

² Cf. WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. 197; SCHNEIDER, *Einführung i.d. Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 56; WEINREICH, *Gebet u. Wunder*, p. 359; PETERSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 184, note 1: ἐξαίφνης, "suddenly," is part of the essence of the miracle.

³ TACITUS, *Hist.*, IV, 81: the lame and the blind were healed immediately. HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*: a dumb lad suddenly recovered his voice (p. 11, miracle 5); a dumb girl immediately began to call for her mother when she saw a snake in the temple (p. 27, miracle 44). After incubation a dumb woman spoke immediately (p. 29, miracle 51). A blind man suddenly saw his missing bottle of salve (p. 33, miracle 65). A typical example is given by Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Posthomerica*, IV, 396-404. He tells how Podalirius quickly (τάχῃ) healed all the wounds of two men by means of salve supplied him by his father (= Aesculapius), which brought about healing the same day (αὐτῇμαρ); the wounds were immediately (ἄφ'αρ) healed and the pain relieved. See EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, p. 96.

⁴ CARREL, *L'Homme, cet inconnu*, p. 175 f.: "Notre conception actuelle de l'influence de la prière sur les états pathologiques est basée sur l'observation des malades qui, presque instantanément, ont été guéris d'affections variées, telles que tuberculose osseuse ou péritonéale, abcès froids, plaies suppurantes, lupus, cancer, etc." "Le miracle est caractérisé surtout par une accélération extrême des processus de réparation organique" (p. 176).

⁵ DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 22 f. εὐθέως or εὐθὺς, occurs 18 times in

The fact that the word "immediately" may be regarded as part of the style of miracle stories in no way implies that Hellenistic influences must be envisaged; the word has obtained its place and importance in the form from the situation.

9. *Pleas, defence and actions by demons.* The demon knows the power of the miracle-worker, Mk. 1 : 24. He begs for mercy, Mk. 5 : 7, or beseeches Jesus, Mk. 5 : 12. We encounter similar features in rabbinical and Hellenistic literature.¹ BULTMANN draws attention to these parallels, to which he devotes only a few words. However, they must be studied more closely if the difference between them and the references in the New Testament is properly to be seen. FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS tells the story of the Jew Eleazar, who cured the possessed. After—note!—the evil spirit had fled and Eleazar had forbidden the demon to return, the magician filled a pitcher with water and, as further proof of the power of his spell, commanded the demon to knock over the pitcher, and so to show that he had left the possessed person. The evil spirit obeyed.² Apollonius once ordered a demon to leave a lad, whereupon the demon cried out: "I will throw down that statue," pointing to one. "The statue first swayed on its axis and then fell," among loud cries and applause from the public.³ BULTMANN recalls Mk. 5 : 13 and sees in this a traditional feature. However, the question is whether the demons in Mk. 5 gave a demonstration of destruction, as is the case in the above stories, in the first under compulsion, in the second of the demon's own accord.⁴ The sole point of comparison is the destruction and

Matthew, 45 times in Mark, 8 times in Luke and 7 times in John. A synonym is *παρὰρῆμα*, which occurs twice in Matthew and 10 times in Luke. According to DALMAN the Aramaic radical is ܦܪܡܐ, which means "forthwith, immediately thereafter." PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 706, takes εὐθὺς as εὐ-θέειν, i.e. go well: "weil es auf dem geraden Wege gut und leicht geht. Dieser etymologische und ursprüngliche Significat des 'Gutgehens' wird nun jedesmal erst durch den Context bestimmt: ob 'bald' oder 'von nun an bis später hinaus'" is meant. Mt. 13 : 5, cf. Mk. 4 : 5 cannot mean "at once", according to PAULUS, whilst in John 6 : 21 "immediately" means: in such a way that it went well (II, p. 243).

¹ FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 25 f. Rabbi Hanina ben Dosa forbade the female demon Igrat to wander around in inhabited regions. "Then she said to him: I beg you, leave me a little latitude. He left her the sabbath nights and the Wednesday nights" (b. *Pesachim* fol. 112b/113a). VITA APOLL., IV, 20: the demon possessing a lad offered to Apollonius: "to swear that it would leave the lad, and never enter any human being again." Cf. BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

² FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, VIII, II, 5.

³ VITA APOLL., IV, 20.

⁴ See the healing of the Gadarene demoniac.

the damage respectively, but for the rest the data are so scanty that we can hardly speak of a "miracle style."

10. *The reactions of the bystanders.* In the accounts given in the Gospels the bystanders who witness miracles can be divided into three groups: the disciples, the leaders of the Jews and the people, whilst mention is also made of indirect reactions. Strangely enough, little is said of the impression which the miracles of Jesus made on the disciples in particular. Did the Evangelists include them by implication among the throng? The feeding of the five thousand hardly, if at all, moved the disciples, Mk. 6 : 52. At the stilling of the storm they "feared exceedingly"¹, whilst they "were sore amazed in themselves beyond measure" when Jesus walked on the water.² They were "astonished" at the sight of the miraculous catch of fish, Lk. 5 : 9. The sign at the wedding at Cana strengthened the disciples in their belief, Jn. 2 : 11.

The leaders of the Jews displayed nothing but resentment and opposition. Whilst the astonished multitude showed their approval, the Pharisees ascribed Jesus' works to the Devil.³ The miracles that Jesus performed in the temple were censured.⁴ After a healing on the Sabbath the Pharisees were "filled with madness," Lk. 6 : 11, while on another occasion on the Sabbath they were reduced to speechlessness by a pithy pronouncement by Jesus.⁵ The healings on the Sabbath aroused the Jewish leaders' desire to kill Jesus.⁶ We also find resentment and opposition among the residents of Nazareth⁷ and among the Gadarenes, whilst Herod Antipas ascribed the works of Jesus to John redivivus.⁸

A certain stability may be noted in the attitude of the people. The Evangelists repeatedly point out that the multitude come to

¹ Mk. 4 : 41: ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν. Lk. 8 : 25: φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν.

² Mk. 6 : 51: καὶ λίαν ἐκ περισσοῦ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς ἐξίσταντο.

³ Mt. 9 : 34; but compare Lk. 11 : 15, which has τινές; Mt. 12 : 24.

⁴ Mt. 21 : 15; cf. Mk. 11 : 18.

⁵ Lk. 14 : 4, 6. The silence of the opponents is also mentioned in Mk. 12 : 34, cf. Mt. 22 : 46; Lk. 20 : 26, 40, whilst in Lk. 13 : 17 it is pointed out that Jesus' adversaries were "ashamed."

⁶ Mt. 12 : 14; Mk. 3 : 6; Lk. 6 : 11; Jn. 5 : 18; 11 : 45-53. Cf. Lk. 13 : 14.

⁷ Mt. 13 : 53-58; Mk. 6 : 1-6; Lk. 4 : 28-30.

⁸ See Mt. 14 : 2; Mk. 6 : 14.

DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 164 f., thinks that the literal meaning was: "mighty works were performed by him," cf. Mt. 11 : 21, 23, which would be a record of facts. However, the question is whether Herod expected magical arts of Jesus. See GRUNDMANN, *TWNT*, II, p. 304.

Jesus, appeal to Him and follow Him, often accompanied by sick persons.¹ In various terms the Gospel-writers describe the reactions of the multitude. They were "astonished" at His doctrine.² The deeds of Jesus filled the bystanders with "fear"³; the latter "marvelled."⁴ Those present were "amazed"⁵ or "astonished."⁶ They "glorified" God on account of the healings⁷ and spread the fame of Jesus far and wide.⁸

We also encounter such statements in other miracle tales. Great multitudes followed Peter⁹ and Thomas.¹⁰ Apollonius of Tyana was

¹ Mt. 4 : 24, 25 (multitudes from Galilee, Decapolis, Jerusalem, Judaea, beyond Jordan); 8 : 1, 18; 12 : 15; 14 : 13; 15 : 30; 20 : 29. Mk. 1 : 33 (all the city); 1 : 45; 2 : 2, 13; 3 : 7, 8 (multitudes from Galilee, Judaea, Jerusalem, Idumaea, beyond Jordan, about Tyre and Sidon) 20, 32; 4 : 1; 5 : 21, 24; 6 : 34; 8 : 1; 10 : 1, 46; Lk. 4 : 42; 5 : 1, 15; 6 : 17; 7 : 11; 8 : 4, 19, 40; 9 : 11, 37; 11 : 29; 12 : 1 (an innumerable multitude); 14 : 25; 15 : 1 (all the publicans and sinners); 18 : 36; 19 : 3. Jn. 6 : 2.

² ἐκπλήσσω, be beside oneself; be overwhelmed by fear or astonishment. See Mt. 7 : 28; 13 : 54; 22 : 33. Mk. 1 : 22; 6 : 2; 7 : 37; 11 : 18. Lk. 4 : 32. The same verb in Mt. 19 : 25 (amazed); Mk. 10 : 26 (astonished); Lk. 2 : 48 (amazed); 9 : 43 (amazed); Ac. 13 : 12 (astonished).

³ φόβος, φοβέω, fear, terror, frightening. Lk. 7 : 16; Mt. 9 : 8; some mss. ἐθαύμασαν.

⁴ θαυμάζω, marvel in Mt. 8 : 27; 9 : 33; Mk. 5 : 20; cf. also Mt. 22 : 22; Mk. 12 : 17 (the Pharisees marvel); Ac. 2 : 7; 3 : 12. Wonder in Mt. 15 : 31; Lk. 8 : 25 (the disciples); Lk. 11 : 14. See BERTRAM, TWNT, III, p. 27 ff.

⁵ ἐξίστημι, amazed in Mt. 12 : 23; Mk. 2 : 12; 6 : 51 (the disciples were "sore amazed in themselves beyond measure"); Lk. 5 : 26 (ἐκστασις). Cf. Ac. 2 : 7; 9 : 21. Astonished in Mk. 5 : 42; Lk. 8 : 56; cf. Ac. 10 : 45. Wondered in Ac. 8 : 13.

⁶ θαμβέω, amazed in Mk. 1 : 27; Lk. 4 : 36; cf. Mk. 10 : 24 (the disciples were astonished at his words); Ac. 3 : 10, 11 (ἐκθαμβος, greatly wondering). See BERTRAM, TWNT, III, p. 3 ff. When Bertram says: "Die Ausdrücke der Furcht und des Staunens... dienen also dazu, den Offenbarungsgehalt und dh die christologische Bedeutung zahlreicher synoptischer Jesusszenen hervorzuheben" (p. 6), he disregards the psychological factor, which is definitely present here as well. More correctly, PERELS, Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker, says of the astonishment, etc., of the people: "Alle diese Gefühle sind als positive Stellung zu Jesu Tat oder Wort anzusehen," p. 27. GRUNDMANN, Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt, p. 72: the multitude suspected the force and the might of Jesus.

⁷ δοξάζω, glorify, see Mt. 9 : 8; 15 : 31. Mk. 2 : 12. Lk. 4 : 15; 5 : 25, 26; 7 : 16. Cf. Lk. 13 : 13; 17 : 15; 18 : 43. Cf. Mt. 14 : 33, οἱ δὲ... προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, then they... worshipped him.

⁸ Mt. 9 : 26, 31. Mk. 1 : 28, 45; Lk. 4 : 14, 37; 5 : 15; 7 : 17.

⁹ ACTA PETRI, 9: "In Tripolis zogen mit ihm auch Lernbegierige aus Tyrus, Sidon, Berytus, Byblus und den Nachbarorten, in beträchtlicher Anzahl ein, während aus der Stadt [Tripolis] selbst grosse Volksmassen sich [zu Petrus] drängten, begierig, ihn kennenzulernen" (HENNECKE, Neutestam. Apokr., p. 224).

¹⁰ ACTA THOM., cap. 82.

always surrounded by a large crowd.¹ The celebrated Paracelsus (d. 1541) was continually followed by a mass of people.² When Peter had once brought a young man back from the dead, the people present were greatly amazed, and cried: "Thou, God the Saviour, Thou God of Peter, invisible God and Saviour!"³ After having related how Apollonius had cured a possessed lad and the departing demon had overturned a statue, the author continues: "who could describe the shout which went up over it, and the applause of the wondering crowd?"⁴ And after Apollonius had saved from execution in Alexandria the suspected robber Phario, whose innocence came to light, the author remarks: "I need not describe the sensation in Egypt over this, and how that people, who are always fond of the marvellous, applauded Apollonius."⁵

In view of these analogies, many also regard the admiration and acclamation of the multitudes in the Gospels as a typical feature. The people must be present during the miracle as witnesses, and must glorify the miracle-worker by their acclamation. PETERSEN recalls the woman who suffered from an issue of blood and who at Jesus' command had to tell of her cure, Lk. 8 : 47; here, too, the people had thus to be witnesses.⁶ PETERSEN perceives in the "admiration" a transition to glorification.⁷ However, the acclamation proper, such as we know from Egyptian miracle tales, occurs neither in the accounts of the cures at Epidauros nor in the miracle stories of the Gospels. It seems to have entered miracle stories later, via the Romans.⁸

¹ VITA APOLL., IV, 1: "In Ionia, when they saw the Master on his way to Ephesus, even the artisans left their work and followed after him . . ." Cf. IV, 10: all Smyrna listened to Apollonius; IV, 18; IV, 41: the concourse in Rome; V, 24: ditto in Alexandria, where he was regarded as a god; VIII, 15: Apollonius appears at the Olympic games. "But when his arrival was confirmed, Greece had never come to any Olympic games with such eagerness as it flocked on that occasion to see him" (transl. Eells).

² TROELS LUND, *Gesundheit u. Krankheit*, p. 153: "Alle Leidenden strömten ihm entgegen, vom Fürsten und Reichen an bis zum Ausschuss der Städte; nach glücklich vollendeter Kur betrogen ihn die ersteren in der Regel um den Arztlohn, die letzteren lachten ihn aus oder vergassen ihn."

³ ACTUS VERCELLENSES, cap. 27.

⁴ VITA APOLL., IV, 20.

⁵ VITA APOLL., V, 24.

⁶ PETERSEN, op. cit., p. 191.

⁷ PETERSEN, op. cit., p. 195: "Das Verbum θαυμάζειν bekommt zum Teil die Bedeutung von Preisen. Das 'Staunen' im religiösen Sinne geht so in den Lobpreis über."

⁸ PETERSEN, op. cit., p. 195: "Interessant ist, dass im Neuen Testament die

If we consider the material dealt with under 1–10 above, and again ask ourselves the question raised at the beginning of this chapter, i.e. whether analogies must necessarily have any connection with derivation and dependence, we must conclude that the research work in which the possibilities of the form technique are scanned yields only sparse results.

Who can decide whether and how a miracle story grew in accordance with certain themes around certain kernels or around pronouncements of Jesus? Who can trace the development of a miracle story? PERELS has attempted this precarious undertaking; at least he puts forward a few possibilities. The story of the resuscitation of Jairus' daughter and of the woman with the issue of blood, as reported by Mark, could for instance be based in this form on an eye-witness account or could have been handed down in this vivid way. But both this report and other stories of miracles display features "which we know from Hellenistic topics. It is probable that Hellenism has exerted its influence here."¹ If we accept these miracles as an old stage of development, the development can have followed two paths, says PERELS, namely (a) by further extension, as in the stories of the Gadarene demoniac and the epileptic boy, and (b) by simplification, in which the stories were de-Hellenized, as in the account of the woman with the issue of blood, in Matthew's version, and in that of the healing of the leper.

There is also the possibility that the original versions of the miracle stories have been greatly abridged or have been schematized. PERELS considers both theories of development conceivable.² In his opinion the short, pregnant dialogue form of the miracle story is primary; a more detailed treatment must for the greater part be ascribed to the influence of the Hellenistic environment and cannot be regarded

eigentliche Akklamation innerhalb der Wundergeschichte fehlt." It must be remarked that the "amazement" in the N.T. relates to both Jesus' teaching and His deeds, as a result of which a distinction comes to the fore between the miracle stories of the N.T. and the Hellenistic material, p. 213. Cf. also DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 54 f., on the "Chor-Schluss," and p. 71 ff.

¹ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 74 f. He goes on: "Dieser [i.e. Hellenism] könnte sich aber auch so geltend gemacht haben, dass die aus der sonstigen Form der Wundergeschichte bekannten Züge sich auch bei den neutestamentlichen Wundern besonders fest hielten; und, da sie ja bei den Hellenisten wie in der Urgemeinde dazu dienen sollten, die Geschichte besonders eindrucksvoll darzustellen, mag hier die Erzählungsgeschichtlichkeit mit dem Einfluss der Umwelt zusammengewirkt haben." His reasoning is obscure.

² PERELS. *op. cit.*, p. 74 ff.

as original.¹ In truly subtle fashion PERELS tries to find a solution, but the result is too hypothetical. After all, it *might* be that the "Hellenistic colouring" proves to come straight from Palestinian soil!

It is similarly believed that a certain development can be established from the "magnification" and "exaggeration" of miracles, and even that the traces of the process can be found by comparing those accounts of miracles that deal with the same subject-matter. This literary procedure may be compared with the efforts of later authors who took great pains to supply where possible the original omissions of names and places.² Although allowance will have to be made for the possibility, it would be as well not to be too quick to find a magnification or an urge to exaggerate somewhere. In Mk. 6 : 5, for instance, it is said that in Nazareth Jesus "could there do no mighty work," while Mt. 13 : 58 states that He "did not do many mighty works" there. Must Matthew be accused of exaggeration? This need in no way be so; in the light of the mass healings in other places those in Nazareth were insignificant; they are simply omitted, and each of the Evangelists has indicated this in his own way.³ If it is assumed that in the resurrections performed by Jesus a climax is deliberately aimed at (Jairus' daughter: deathbed; young man at Nain: bier; Lazarus: grave), then right behind this assumption the problem of the credibility of the accounts crops up. The view that the resurrection of Jairus' daughter has the best "historical" chance in that case is evidence of a too flatly rational interpretation of the accounts. VON SODEN's assertion that tradition has gradually built up the deeds of Jesus "to something ever more wonderful, transcending all analogies" leads us into a maelstrom of assumptions and uncertainties in which the reduction method

¹ PERELS, *op. cit.*, p. 89: "Die Entwicklung der Überlieferung ist dann so zu denken: am Anfang steht die Wundertat Jesu. Mit der Weitererzählung muss eine Verkürzung des Tatbestandes eingetreten sein. Dabei bildet sich eine bestimmte Form heraus, in der die Geschichten überliefert werden. Der Grundstock ist die Bitte oder auch nur die wartende Anwesenheit eines Hilfesuchenden und das Machtwort Jesu, das die sofortige Wirkung mit sich bringt" . . . "Die überlieferte Geschichte ist aus historischem Geschehen und stilisierender Überlieferung gemeinsam entstanden," p. 90.

² See W. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 516 ff. Cf. for instance Mk. 14 : 47; Lk. 22 : 50; Jn. 18 : 10; Mk. 14 : 13 and Lk. 22 : 8. The apocryphal literature gives all kinds of supplementary examples.

³ Think of the expression: "there was nobody in the hall," whereas people were actually present. Cf. also Mt. 8 : 16; Mk. 1 : 34; Lk. 4 : 40, 41 . . . SCHNEIDER, *Einführung i.d. Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 56, also regards the "couples" in Matthew, Mt. 8 : 28-34; 9 : 27-31; 20 : 30-34, as "Steigerung."

may have to serve as lifeboat.¹ Allowance will always have to be made for the possibility that detailed information in the miracle stories, which one is inclined to attribute to a later editor, may in reality be original, whilst an austere and abridged version is secondary.

(c) *Rabbinical and Hellenistic miracle literature*

We shall now review as a whole the vexed question of whether the accounts of miracles in the Gospels were influenced from elsewhere. It is to the credit of FIEBIG that he has pointed the way to the rabbinical parallels. He considers it self-evident that Jewish literature should be consulted before Hellenistic, Roman and even Buddhist miracle stories are studied. FIEBIG points to the affinity in style between the Jewish miracle stories and those of the New Testament.² Furthermore, attention should be paid to the similarity in the kind of miracles: resurrections from the dead, stories featuring the sea, miraculous feedings, encounters with demons, miraculous catches of fish.³ However, there also prove to be differences: in

¹ VON SODEN, *Die wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu*, p. 75. SCHMIEDEL, *Hauptprobleme der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 44: "Es ist nun selbstverständlich, dass die wirklich verrichteten Heilungen durch die späteren Überlieferungen gesteigert und vermehrt worden sind, wie wir das an vielen Beispielen nachweisen können." JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, expresses himself more cautiously. "An sich ist es ja wohl denkbar, dass im einzelnen eine Steigerung des Wunderbaren stattgefunden hat" (p. 35). OEPKE, *TWNT*, III, p. 205, perceives a growth in tradition in Lk. 22 : 51 as well: "Stellenweise können wir das Wachstum noch in unseren Texten verfolgen. Erst die spätere Überlieferung weiss, dass Jesus das abgeschlagene Ohr des hohepriesterlichen Knechtes in der Leidensnacht heilte (Lk. 22, 51)." Oepke believes that Formgeschichte has shown that: "Ausmalung der überlieferten Umrisse" is no more excluded than: "das Nachwachsen völlig neuer Berichte" . . . "Sogar mit der Übertragung fremder Stoffe auf Jesus mag in einzelnen Fällen (Mk. 5, 1 ff. par?) zu rechnen sein." BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 241: the miracles have passed through various stages in tradition. "Die Motive wandern, Varianten entstehen, Steigerungen setzen sich an." Everywhere: "Steigerung des Wunderbaren" can be discovered in the details (p. 243). FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 16 f. The healings of Jesus are regarded as "miracles": "und zwar unter fortschreitender Steigerung des Wunderbaren" (p. 17).

² FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 74: "Im Stil der Erzählungsweise zeigen die neutestamentlichen Wundergeschichten ihre Verwandtschaft mit den jüdischen in vielen Einzelheiten und in der Knappheit der Ausdrucksweise, in der Anwendung der direkten Rede, in der häufigen Ausschmückung der Erzählung mit alttestamentlichen Citaten, in dem Wertlegen auf die Autorschaft der Geschichte und die Worte der vorkommenden Personen, während die Datierung der Geschichte nach Tag, Monat, Jahr völlig zurücktritt, ebenso die Lokalisierung. Dabei fehlt es weder den jüdischen noch den neutestamentlichen Wundergeschichten an konkreten Einzelheiten."

³ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

the New Testament no rain miracle occurs, whilst the exorcism of demons and the healing of the lame and the blind hardly occur, if at all, among the rabbinical stories. FIEBIG sees resemblances in many points, and is doubtless correct when he says that the rabbinical miracle stories speak of the *one* God, whereas the pagan miracle stories have a background of polytheism. He believes that this distinction alone must be sufficient to give priority to the writings of the rabbis.¹ DIBELIUS also deals at length with rabbinical literature. He commends Fiebig for his view that the study of the Talmud is of great importance to New Testament science, but accuses him of making light of the many difficulties with which rabbinical literature confronts us. According to DIBELIUS, the rabbinical miracle tales concentrate chiefly on two foci of interest. Firstly the rabbis wish to prove by means of a miraculous event that God expresses His approval of a matter which is of great concern to Him, viz. observance of the law. DIBELIUS calls these miracles theodicy legends. They form an individual type and proclaim the divine law by which man must live. The miracle itself is subsidiary here. This type figures the most prominently. Secondly, miracles happen to the greater glory of a rabbi, and these are called by DIBELIUS personal legends. Then miracles happen which confer honour on holy places, legends of place. The rabbis are intensive prayers: the rabbi is therefore not great through his power, but through his relation to God. Despite the similarity in the usual topics, which are also present in the rabbinical miracle stories, the difference between these stories and those of the New Testament is remarkably great, says DIBELIUS.² And so, although analogies can be found, it is difficult to envisage an essential relation.

As we have already seen, the question whether Hellenistic miracle literature has influenced the Gospels is answered in the affirmative

¹ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 73, note: "Schon dieser Unterschied allein genügt, um zu begründen, dass die nächsten Analogieen zu den neutestamentlichen Wundern, insbesondere zu den Wundern Jesu, in den rabbinischen Schriften zu vermuten und anzutreffen sind." OEPKE, *TWNT*, III, p. 205, expresses himself cautiously. "Die fixierte tannaitische Tradition ist von den Taten etwa eines Chanina ben Dosa (um 70) bereits reichlich ein Jahrhundert entfernt. Über die damit gegebene Möglichkeit der Legendenbildung hülfte selbst eine geschlossene Kette von Autoritäten nicht hinweg. Viele jüdische Wundergeschichten tragen den Stempel des Übertriebenen an der Stirn. Anderes kann, in den Grundzügen wenigstens, sehr wohl historisch sein."

² DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, pp. 131-149. See also MCGINLEY, *Form-Criticism of the Synoptic Healing Narratives*, p. 96 ff., Ch. V, Rabbinic analogies.

by many. BULTMANN is of the opinion that in both the oral and the literary stage of tradition foreign material had already penetrated. He further makes a distinction between a Palestinian and a Hellenistic stage, and considers it certain that the Palestinian believers were already hearing stories of Jesus' miracles.¹ But in general the miracle stories will have to be attributed to Hellenistic influences.² According to DIBELIUS the possibility that "pagan" miracle stories were transferred to Jesus may not be rejected; see in particular Mk. 5 : 1-20.³ In PERELS' opinion the influence of the Hellenistic world is present in the following five stories: the resurrection of the young man at Nain; the healing of the deaf and dumb man; the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida; the curing of the Gadarene demoniac and the healing of the epileptic boy.⁴ Hellenism affected Mark's accounts of miracles

¹ BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 254 f. Palestinian are, for instance, Mt. 12 : 27, 28 and the apophthegms containing a miracle: Mt. 12 : 22 ff. and parallel passages; Mk. 3 : 22 ff.; 3 : 1-5; 7 : 24-30; Mt. 8 : 5-13. However, they need not all have been formed on Palestinian soil. Mk. 4 : 35-41; 6 : 34-44 and 1 : 40-45 are probably also of Palestinian origin . . . Bultmann and Dibelius have each built up their own system of concepts to classify their views on the style, form and topic of the Gospels. As regards the miracles, it amounts to the following. Bultmann arranges under I, "Die Überlieferung der Worte Jesu," A. the "Apophthegmata," which he further divides into "Streit- und Schulgespräche" and "Biographische Apophthegmata" and B. the "Herrenworte." Under II, "Die Überlieferung des Erzählungsstoffes," he arranges A. the "Wundergeschichten," further subdivided into "Heilungswunder" and "Naturwunder," and B. "Geschichtserzählung und Legende." Dibelius divides the material into (a) "Das Paradigma," in which he makes a distinction between pure and less pure types; (b) "Die Novelle;" (c) "Die Legende." In general it may be said that Bultmann's apophthegm corresponds to Dibelius' paradigm and that Bultmann's "Wundergeschichte" corresponds to Dibelius' "Novelle." MCGINLEY has given a painstaking analysis and thorough criticism of the theories of both authors. He rightly says for instance of Bultmann's apophthegm: "It is such a mixture of arbitrary statements and detailed analysis, of capricious bias and clever dissection, that it leaves the reader overwhelmed and confused" (op. cit., p. 43). We shall state for every miracle Bultmann's and Dibelius' classification of it . . . HELD, *Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch.* (BORNKAMM et al., *Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev.*, p. 229 ff.), is of the opinion that for the miracle stories in Mt. the concepts "Wundergeschichte" and "Novelle" cannot be used. They have the form of the conversation, of the paradigm. In Mt. Jesus' miracles have: "eine beispielhafte Bedeutung erhalten."

² BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 256: "Im übrigen dürfte der hellenistische Ursprung der Wundergeschichten überwiegend wahrscheinlich sein."

³ M. DIBELIUS, *Die Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, I, p. 29. But it is also possible that the "phantasievolle Schilderung" is based on an old account that was adorned: "in der Weise, wie er in jener 'Kleinliteratur' üblich war." Cf. M. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*.

⁴ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 85: "Auf diese fünf Wunder allein lässt sich auch die These Reitzensteins von der Parallelität der

in particular.¹ PERELS does not share BULTMANN's exaggerated leanings towards Hellenism. For instance, the reports on the exorcism of demons did not originate in the Hellenistic world, for belief in demons was universal. Consequently, according to PERELS it is quite feasible that the banishing of the unclean spirit in the synagogue at Capernaum happened as it is related.²

We shall leave it at the views of these three recent scholars. We have noted a common outlook, but at the same time differences.

Now, can a concrete case of direct derivation or unmistakable affinity be indicated anywhere? The answer to this must be no. BULTMANN was well aware of this when he wrote that the material mentioned by him "cannot be regarded—or only in very rare cases—as a source for certain synoptic miracle stories. However, it illustrates the atmosphere; it shows motives and forms and so helps us to understand the penetration of miracle stories into the evangelical tradition."³ This "illustration of the atmosphere," however, does

Evangelien mit der hellenistischen Literatur basieren. Mit Ausnahme der Markus-Lukasfassung der Geschichte von der Blutflüssigen und Jairus ist die übrige synoptische Überlieferung davon frei." Cf. p. 96 ff.

¹ PERELS, op. cit., p. 92: "Dass Markus gerade in der *Wunderüberlieferung* so viele hellenistische Züge hat, wird daran liegen, dass hier die Versuchung zur Aufnahme solcher Elemente infolge der hellenistischen Wunderwelt am grössten war."

² PERELS, op. cit., p. 85 f.

³ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 253 . . . In the "Conclusion" of his study, op. cit., p. 152 ff., the Roman Catholic scholar MCGINLEY comments: "If from a study of form we can detect anything of the milieu in which a tradition originates and evolves, then a dominating factor has entered the rise and growth of the synoptic tradition to which the rabbinic and Hellenic stories are alien. Traits common to all three traditions are only those due to the choice of subject matter and the unity of human nature. The Jewish and Greek converts to the primitive Christian community did not introduce into the synoptic tradition the motifs of the rabbinic and Hellenic traditions they knew so well. The evidence that they *did not* do so lies in all those traits which distinguish the Gospel story from its contemporary traditions—particularly in a completely different *historical and spiritual* tone. The reason that *they could not* do so lies in the fact that the synoptic tradition did not originate or develop in the same fashion as the rabbinic or Hellenic literature. It was not a compilation of popular anecdotes, evolving over a long period of time, careless of the reality of its facts. It was a threefold historico-apologetic composition, written by definite authors, in a hierarchical community, at a time when witnesses of the events were still alive and aflame with zeal to propagate or annihilate the new religion. To the question posed in beginning this investigation: *Do the Gospel healing stories so resemble their rabbinic and Hellenic parallels that they must have originated in a similar way?* we can answer categorically: *The synoptic narratives so differ from the analogies adduced that their very form indicates a different origin and development.* In brief: the argument from analogy, tested according to form-critical methods on the proving ground of healing narratives, demonstrates

not provide as such a single argument. In our opinion it is determined for the greater part by the susceptibility of the researcher to certain associations.

The problem engaging us cannot be dealt with or solved piecemeal, but is part of the major problem, the relation between Hellenism and the New Testament. There is no essential relation between these two worlds of ideas. And this is decisive. The use of corresponding words, concepts, turns of phrase, etc., such as we also encounter in Paul, is not enough to serve as proof of the existence of an actual relation.¹ For the words used first acquire their value through their function in the whole. Just as "in essence there is no relation between Paul's proclamation and the Hellenistic world of ideas, but on the contrary a sharp contrast," so there is no relation between the Hellenistic miracles and those of the Gospels.² GRUNDMANN has formulated the difference between the miracles of the New Testament and the extra-Christian ones in the following three points: (a) the New Testament miracle has nothing to do with sorcery or magic; (b) the New Testament miracle happens by the word of Jesus or His disciples; (c) the stress falls on the necessity of faith; Jesus binds man to His Person.³

Moreover, the place occupied by miracles in the whole of the proclamation of the Gospel must always be borne in mind. The miracles form part of the appearance of Jesus Christ as the Bringer of salvation in the full sense of the word; they reveal His triumphant

the falsity of form-criticism's general conclusions." McGinley wants to use form-analysis as a tool but not as a weapon. He concludes his work as follows: "To the writer it seems that the good points of the method will find a permanent though subordinate place in future scriptural studies; but that the theory as a whole, in the extreme form proposed by Bultmann and Dibelius, is moribund. As the flowering of a century and a half of German rationalist criticism, it may perhaps be hoped that the blossom, being inbred, will be sterile, and that in the new Germany the line will be more clearly drawn between the exegesis which is truly Christian, and that which is fundamentally pagan" (p. 154).

¹ See J. N. SEVENSTER, in Waszink et al., *Het oudste christendom en de antieke cultuur*, II, p. 299 ff.

² J. N. SEVENSTER, *op. cit.*, p. 300. Sevenster illustrates this with a number of examples. STAUFFER, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testamentes*, pp. 83-88. Primeval Christianity is: "vorhellenistisch und anti-hellenistisch" (p. 88). See also CLEMEN, *Der Einfluss der Mysterien-religionen auf das älteste Christentum*. VAN UNNIK, *Hedendaagse problemen in de N. Test. Wetenschap*. As regards new research and ideas on the problem of the Hellenization of Christianity, see the same author's *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*.

³ GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 65 ff. Cf. PERELS, *op. cit.*, p. 86.

power over all evil forces and elements, even over death itself; they "portray" the coming Kingdom.¹ In Aesculapius, Dionysus, Apollonius, Simon Magus, etc., we find no trace of such ideas. The climate is entirely different.

To sum up, we may say that, although the investigation into form, style and type may be valuable in other respects, within the framework of our study it does not go much further than to point to analogies. One must always try first of all to explain and understand the origin and existence of miracles from their own environment and situation.

Recognition of the "situation" in the New Testament does not depend solely on the results of the work of literary criticism and historical criticism, but also and essentially on the theological evaluation of the New Testament writings, on belief in Jesus Christ as the Proclaimer and the Bringer of the Kingdom of God.

¹ OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 213: "Die Heilungen sind selbst schon Teilsiege der Gottesherrschaft. Das Heer der Dämonen flieht. Wo Jesus hilft, da hat sich an einem bestimmten Punkte die Herrschaft Gottes realisiert, völlig freilich erst dann, wenn das Wunder in diesem Sinne auch verständnisvoll aufgenommen wird. Jeder Teilsieg ist aber Vorbote und Bürgschaft des Endsieges . . . Die Wunderheilungen Jesu nehmen hiernach, trotz aller vorhandenen Analogien, in der Religionsgeschichte eine besondere Stellung ein. Sie stehen in unzertrennlichem Zusammenhange mit der Eigenart und dem einzigartigen Sendungsbewusstsein Jesu." Cf. BEYER, TWNT, III, p. 131. G. SEVENSTER warns in Waszink et al., "Het oudste christendom en de antieke cultuur," II, p. 47, against isolating miracles from the rest of the subject-matter, as form criticism does. One must not forget the relation of miracles to the centre of Synoptic preaching, i.e. "the coming of the Kingdom of God in the ministry of Jesus Christ."

II. MAGICAL AND MIRACULOUS PRACTICES OF THE JEWES IN JESUS' DAY

The religion of Israel was always strongly opposed to any form of magic: all who practised it had to be killed, Ex. 22 : 18; Lev. 20 : 27, Deu. 18 : 10-13.

Although King Saul made vigorous attempts to eradicate "those that had familiar spirits, and the wizards" in Israel, his visit to the witch of Endor proved that he had not succeeded, 1 Sa. 28. When King Joram of Israel asked Jehu: "Is it peace,?" Jehu answered: "What peace, so long as the whoredoms of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many?" (2 Ki. 9 : 22).

In Isa. 47 : 12, 13 words of censure are spoken about the numerous sorceries in which the people have laboured from their youth, and the astrologers are exposed. Belief in the influence of the stars on man's lot, in fortune-telling and all kinds of witchcraft, and not least belief in demons, is encountered in Israel and the later Jewish people just as strongly as in other peoples. Outside influences played an active part in this, and the cultures of Babylonia and Egypt in particular left their marks on the life of the people of Israel. BLAU is of the opinion that Babylonia was the particular source of astrology and fortunetelling, whilst Egypt was the cradle of sorcery.¹ "Ten measures of magic came down upon this world; nine of these measures were taken by Egypt and one by the whole of the remaining world," says the Talmud.² The Egyptian magician believed that he was divine, a god in human shape.³ Both in Jewish and in Christian and pagan literature the names Jannes and Jambres occur again and again; legend has it that they were the Egyptian magicians who according to Ex. 7 imitated Moses and Aaron in their wonderful practices.⁴

¹ BLAU, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, p. 37 ff. As early as Homer Egypt was considered the home of magic herbs. Pythagoras' philosophical magic was also Egyptian, see p. 42. Cf. DE JONG, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*. "Also war es das Endziel der ägyptischen Weisheit, die Gattungen der Dämonen kennen zu lernen und anzuschauen" (p. 123).

² Kiddushin 49b; see BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 38.

³ REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, p. 236.

⁴ See SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, III, p. 292 ff.; STRACK-BILLERBECK, III, pp. 660-664. Cf. 2 Tim. 3 : 8, where Jannes and Jambres are said to have withstood Moses. They are also mentioned in the "Damaskusschrift" of the sect of Qumran: "Aber Belial erweckte Jannes und seinen Bruder durch seine

According to the Talmud, Jesus brought his magic powers with him from Egypt. Magic was practised especially by women. Ex. 22 : 18 speaks of the witch; cf. also 2 Ki. 9 : 22; Nahum 3 : 4, Ezek. 13 : 17-23. The Talmud tells that Simeon ben Šetaḥ had eighty witches hanged in Askelon on one day,¹ whilst there was a saying: "He who takes many wives increases witchcraft."² Old women and widows in particular were suspected of witchcraft, compare the belief in witches in the Middle Ages; and here, too, the strange relation between love and magic was frequently encountered. A distinction was made between two kinds of magic: malign and benign. This depended on the intentions of the magician. BLAU states that Old Jewish magic (by Old Jewish BLAU means the first five centuries A.D.) consisted principally of the former, whilst the latter was used mainly in self-defence. Many diseases were regarded as the result of enchantment. Hence the attempts to protect oneself by means of spells, amulets, etc. The sick resorted to exorcism; after all, the spirit of the disease had to be driven out! The New Testament also contains references to banishing devils. When Jesus was accused of a pact with Beelzebub, He asked: "by whom do your children cast them out,?" Mt. 12 : 27. In Ac. 8 : 9 a reference is made to Simon Magus, and in Ac. 13 : 6 to the Jewish sorcerer Bar-jesus or Elymas. In Ac. 19 : 13-20 the practices of the seven sons of Sceva are described. Mk. 9 : 38-40 contains a typical pronouncement by Jesus on someone who cast out devils in His name, although he was not a disciple of Jesus. This shows that at quite an early stage great "power" was attributed to the naming of Jesus' name. Some therefore regard Mk. 9 : 38-40 as an interpolation, whilst the person concerned is identified by some as Paul.³

The situation was thus a strange one. Official religion regarded the practice of magic as illegal, but nevertheless both white and

Tücke, damals als Israel zum ersten Male erlöst wurde" (CDC, V, 19; see VAN DER WOUDE, *Die messian. Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, p. 20).

¹ Sanh. 45b; see BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

² ABOTH, II, 7; BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

³ REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, regards Mk. 9 : 38 as interpolation. "Es scheint, dass eine spätere Entscheidung über das Verhalten der Christen zu solchen Männern nachträglich Jesu in den Mund gelegt ist," p. 187, note 3. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, re Mk. 9 : 38: "Nach Volkmar und Holsten vermutet noch heute Loisy, dass der fremde Wundertäter den von den Uraposteln so scheel angesehenen Paulus vorstellen solle." Loisy thinks that it is Paul again in Mk. 9 : 40.

black magic was practised on every hand.¹ BLAU points out that in truly Jewish circles exorcism was not performed "systematically."² Worthy of mention is the statement made by BLAU on the practice of magic by Jews and Christians. One should not be surprised, he says, that the Apostles and the Fathers of the Church gave in completely to the spirit of the times, i.e. to all kinds of magical practices, when one sees that many a Talmud teacher was both mentally and emotionally receptive to magic and demonology, despite strict adherence to the law of the Pentateuch, which states that the magician may not remain alive.³

Whilst discussing Solomon's knowledge of medicine, FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS mentions en passant that he himself once saw a Jew, called Eleazar, who, in the presence of Emperor Vespasian, the latter's sons and various soldiers, cured those who were possessed with a ring of Solomon, i.e. a ring under whose seal a certain root was attached.⁴ Pagan authors also mention Jewish magicians.⁵

Now when have we to do with magic and when with miracles? The boundary between the two is not easy to draw. TRIUS believes

¹ SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*, III. "Während ein reiner und geläuterter Glaube in offizieller Geltung steht, lebt unter dieser Decke noch ein aus der Naturreligion stammender Aberglaube in ungeschwächter Kraft weiter. Überall finden wir als eine primitive Form religiöser Vorstellung den Dämonenglauben und im Zusammenhang damit, wie es scheint, auch überall das Bestreben, die Dämonen durch irgend welche Zauber mittel unschädlich zu machen, ja, sie in den Dienst des Menschen zu stellen" (p. 294 f.). Cf. BIETENHARDT, *TWNT*, V, p. 269: "Das offizielle Judentum führte den Kampf gegen die Zauberei . . . Andererseits werden schon im Talmud nicht nur die Namen Gottes, sondern die einzelnen Buchstaben der Gottesnamen, ja des ganzen hbr Alphabets für zauberkräftig gehalten (vgl. *Men* 29b)." TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, p. 107: "In Talmudic times Biblical verses were often employed to heal wounds and diseases, despite rabbinic opposition to this practice." Despite the objections of HELD, *Magie, Hekserij en Toverij*, p. 148 ff., we believe that one can speak of "white" magic (cf. Lloyd Warner, *A Black Civilisation*, p. 568: "the magic which is helpful to man," quoted in Held) and "black" magic (the magic which is harmful to man, Lloyd Warner).

² BLAU, *op. cit.*, "Der Exorcismus ist jedoch in echt jüdischen Kreisen nicht planmässig betrieben worden" (p. 56). According to BLAU, the remark by Flavius Josephus, *Ant.*, VIII, II, 5, on the universal use of exorcism is applicable only to Jewish Christian circles.

³ BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 28 . . . SCHNEIDER writes in detail about all kinds of magic in *Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums*, I, p. 531 ff.: *Zauber und Aberglaube*.

⁴ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Ant.*, VIII, II, 5. See DE JONG, *Demonische Ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel*, Ch. IV, par. 3, *Demonen bij Flavius Josephus*. As regards Josephus' belief in miracles, see DELLING, *Josephus und das Wunderbare*.

⁵ BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 36.

that in the lowest forms of religion magic and miracles cannot be separated, but that at the level of religion with a God-given law the miracles which the godhead performs either directly or through the agency of specially designated persons must be distinguished from magic as a profane art. Magic uses the underworld, demons.¹ Magic is always a kind of art, it is the *Ars magica*.

The magician tries to bring about something supernatural by means of all kinds of mysterious formulae and manipulations. He "controls" certain powers. However, whether something is regarded as magic or as a miracle does not depend only on a scientific opinion, but also on a subjective opinion, an opinion of faith. In BLAU's statement quoted above the Apostles and Fathers of the Church are credited with all kinds of magical practices which they themselves will most certainly not have described as such!

When the Talmud calls Jesus a magician, it is impossible to agree from the Christian point of view, any more than a Roman Catholic would share the opinion of a Protestant who called the miracles of the saints "magic arts." When we try to find an exact definition of the concepts of miracle and witchcraft, we are confronted with the same difficulties as with the concepts of belief and superstition, since there is no objective criterion. It can be said that miracles are to witchcraft as religion is to magic; a miracle is a religious phenomenon, and witchcraft a magical one.

An important question is whether the rabbis of Jesus' day performed miracles or indulged in the practice of magic. For in Jesus we see the rabbi and the miracle-worker combined: was this a unique case? Opinions differ on the question of whether the rabbis performed miracles. FIEBIG believes that the rabbis of Jesus' time did perform miracles. To support his view he makes use of rabbinical texts which in his opinion date back to the time of the Tannaim, i.e. up to about 200 A.D. A number of examples given by FIEBIG follow.

¹ TITIUS, *Natur u. Gott*, p. 122. DE BOER, *De Voorbede in het O.T.*, calls witchcraft "a degenerate form of magic." Witchcraft is "magic in malam partem," in contrast with "religious magic." De Boer says that the believer, when observing "religious magic practices," is in company with his God "at the place and with the means which his God has shown him" (p. 203 f.) . . . All definitions and views in this matter depend on the content given to the concept "magic" . . . Cf. FREUD, *Totem u. Tabu*, p. 89 f., note 1, p. 90: "Wenn man einen Geist durch Lärm und Geschrei verscheucht, so ist dies eine rein zäuberische Handlung; wenn man ihn zwingt, indem man sich seines Namens bemächtigt, so hat man Magie gegen ihn gebraucht."

About 100 years before Christ Honi, the "circle-drawer" (he drew a magic circle on the ground), performed a rain miracle.¹ The Talmud makes frequent references to rain miracles. Rabbi Akiba and R. Johanan ben Zakkai were also capable of making rain. Nakdimon ben Gurion (before 70 A.D.) prayed for rain and his prayers were generously answered: he got twelve water-butts full (cf. Jn. 2 : 1-11).² The stilling of the storm, Mt. 8 : 23, must be compared with the account describing the stilling of the storm by R. Gamaliel.³ "It may certainly not be assumed that a story as that of R. Gamaliel is borrowed from the New Testament. The details differ on many points. Jesus was considered to be capable of precisely that of which the then Jews believed their rabbis to be capable. Jesus himself considered himself capable thereof, just as the rabbis considered themselves capable thereof."⁴ With reference to a Tannaitic report on the resuscitation of a dead person, FIEBIG says that in the days of the Tannaim, i.e. at the time of the New Testament, in the world in which Jesus lived in Palestine, the rabbis were considered capable of raising the dead.⁵ Further, FIEBIG points to the miracles which took place when rabbis died who had performed miracles in their lifetime.⁶ Comparing the miracles of Jesus with those of the rabbis, FIEBIG comes to the conclusion that it is not correct to try to explain the miracles of Jesus solely on the strength of the Old Testament miracles stories (Moses, Elijah, Elisha), to point to Jesus' Messiahship, or to relate them to the Hellenistic and Buddhist parallels. The rabbinical material demonstrates "that also in Palestine, Jerusalem, Galilee, etc., in the days of Jesus, both at the time shortly before the appearance of Jesus and about 70 A.D. and 100 A.D., miracle stories were ordinary; that the Jews of those towns and of those days told of miracles performed by their teachers and adorned their lives with legends; that the environment in which Jesus lived was therefore such that no-one who knows this environment is surprised when the New Testament also displays the marks of its origin by the fact that it tells of the miracles of Jesus."⁷ FIEBIG also compared

¹ FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 14. For the text see b. Ta' anit, III, 8, Goldschmidt, III, p. 471.

² FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 16. Text: b. Ta' anit, fol. 19b, Goldschmidt, III, p. 474 f.

³ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 33. Text: b. Baba Mezia 59b, Goldschmidt, VI, p. 678 f.

⁴ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

⁵ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 37. See for further details the chapter: The Resurrection of the Dead.

⁶ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 57 ff.

⁷ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 72.

the style of the New Testament miracle narratives with that of the rabbinical tales, and found numerous points of similarity: the pointed remarks, the use of direct speech, the quotations from the Old Testament, whilst in both forms references to time and place recede into the background.¹ Although FIEBIG considers much of the material in the Gospels legendary, he wishes to stress that "precisely as a result of the miracle stories it contains, the New Testament presents itself as an ancient book, as an aspect of the literature and the world of ideas of the Roman Empire."² This is in contrast to Drews, who regards Jesus' miracles as proof that He never lived.³

A year after the publication of Fiebig's book, in 1912, a work by SCHLATTER appeared, in which the author strenuously opposes Fiebig's viewpoint. SCHLATTER draws attention to the fact that Flavius Josephus does not report a single story of a miracle performed by a rabbi. We find that the rabbis are vigorously opposed to sorcery. "It was important that Akiba enforced a strict prohibition against healing by incantation. As a result of this, magic art becomes a sign of heresy in Palestine."⁴ The scribe was not a miracle-worker, but the proclaimer and sustainer of the principle of tradition. He established his identity not by a miracle, but by his quotations from Holy Writ and tradition! It is not until the beginning of the third century that we find the traces of rabbinical miracle stories, parallel with the Christian literature of martyrs' and monks' legends.⁵

SCHLATTER is therefore not prepared to antedate the rabbinical miracle stories under any condition; he tries to make a careful distinction between the Palestinian and the Babylonian stories, and advises Fiebig to do this as well.⁶ Not the teacher but the saint becomes the miracle-worker, and not only in the synagogue, but also in the church.⁷

The saint is the powerful prayer whose blessing has influence.

¹ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

² FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

³ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

⁴ SCHLATTER, *Das Wunder in der Synagoge*, p. 57.

⁵ SCHLATTER, *op. cit.*, p. 57.

⁶ SCHLATTER, *op. cit.*, "Wie ich mich weigere, die Wunder des Johannes oder Paulus in den falschen Apostelgeschichten oder die Kindheitswunder Jesu in das erste Jahrhundert zu verlegen, ebensowenig beteilige ich mich an der Rückdatierung einer Wundergeschichte des babylonischen Talmuds in das erste Jahrhundert, wenn sie in der palästinischen Literatur nirgends zum Vorschein kommt" (p. 58).

⁷ SCHLATTER, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

And what about Hōni, who lived before Christ? According to SCHLATTER, the rabbis' task included prayer as well as teaching. However, the prayer is not a miracle-worker. "The idea behind praying for rain was not that miraculous water would fall from the heavens, but in all cases that now it would rain just as it always rains."¹ This reasoning of SCHLATTER's is really extremely thin. Hōni was doubtless not concerned with "miraculous water," but with prayers being answered, in miraculous fashion if need be!

The Fiebig-Schlatter controversy is still being continued. According to KLAUSNER the people regarded the Pharisees and scribes as holy men and therefore as miracle-workers as well.²

BORNHÄUSER, SCHMIDT, BEYER and others share Schlatter's views.³ PERELS attaches great value to Schlatter's study and viewpoint, which he consequently shares.⁴ However, he is struck by the story about the encounter of R. Hanina ben Dosa with the female demon Igrat; the form of this miracle story corresponds to that of the encounter of Jesus with the Gadarene demoniac. PERELS concludes from this

¹ SCHLATTER, *op. cit.*, p. 76. "Die Erhörung des Gebets bleibt darum bewusst und nachdrücklich 'ein vom Himmel getanes Wunder'; nicht der Beter schickt den Regen, sondern er betet um ihn" (p. 76).

² KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*. "The people looked upon the Pharisees and Scribes as holy men and therefore miracle-workers. Both the Talmud and Midrash give accounts of miracles performed by Rabban Yochanan ben Zakkai and R. Eliezer ben Hyrcanus his disciple, who lived in the time of Jesus. But with the Pharisees miracles were only a secondary interest" (p. 266). Jesus performed miracles, mainly healing miracles, because He regarded Himself as the Messiah. He therefore did them "to an even greater extent than the ordinary Pharisee" (p. 266).

³ BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*. In Jesus' day there was no: "schrankenlos wuchernde Wundersucht," as some think (p. 47). K. L. SCHMIDT, *RGG*, III, col. 144: "Im Judentum zur Zeit Jesu fallen die Funktionen des Lehrens und Wundertuns im ganzen aus einander; der Rabbi ist mit dem Wundertäter nicht identisch. . . Dass die grossen Frommen der damaligen Zeit Wunder getan haben müssten, ist eine ungeschichtliche Vorstellung. Von den berühmten Rabbinen Hillel, Gamaliel, Jochanan ben Zakkai, Akiba werden keine Wunder erzählt. Was überliefert ist, sind Gebetserhörungen in bestimmten Notfällen, Träume, Weissagungen." BEYER, *TWNT*, III. According to Beyer Schlatter has "bündig gezeigt" that the rabbis in Jesus' day performed no healing miracles (p. 129).

⁴ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*. "Den Unterschied des in der nachchristlichen jüdischen Literatur enthaltenen supranaturalen Materials vom synoptischen Wunderbericht hat Schlatter festgestellt. . . Erst vom 3. und noch stärker vom 4. Jahrhundert ab beginnen die Wunderberichte und werden dann auch den Lehrern des 1. Jahrhunderts angehängt. Dass erst in dieser Zeit unter hellenistisch-orientalischem Einfluss die Hauptmasse der wunderbaren Berichte in die jüdische Literatur eindringt, ist auch die überwiegende Meinung der jüdischen Forschung" (p. 78).

that the accounts of exorcism had already acquired a fixed form at an early date.¹

We have deliberately discussed the two viewpoints quite extensively, since the question at issue is of great importance with regard to the problem of the attitude of the Pharisees and scribes to Jesus' miracles.

Everyone who reads the Gospels must be struck by the fact that the Jewish leaders do not seem to be in the least affected by the miraculous healings of Jesus; their attitude might in fact be described as cool. This contrasts with the people, who sought after Jesus again and again for His miracles. This attitude of the Pharisees and the scribes must have some explanation or the other. It is not because they know of Jesus' miracles only through hear-say, for they were often eye-witnesses of them, Mt. 9 : 1-8 and parallel passages; Mt. 12 : 9-14 and parallel passages; Lk. 13 : 10-17; Lk. 14 : 1-6. The censure of the Jewish leaders nowhere falls on the miracles of Jesus as such, but on attendant circumstances; he is reproached with healing on the Sabbath, Mt. 12 : 9-14 and parallel passages, Lk. 13 : 10-17, Lk. 14 : 1-6; Jn. 5 : 1-18; 9 : 1-41; remember the cutting words of the Pharisees: "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the sabbath day," Jn. 9 : 16. They resent Jesus saying that He could forgive sins, Mt. 9 : 3 and parallel passages, and see in His signs the particular danger that He is gaining in influence and thus may also bring in His train political dangers, Jn. 11 : 47, 48. A particularly striking account is that in Mt. 21 : 15, 16: the chief priests and scribes see the wonderful things that Jesus does in the temple. They say nothing about this, but when the children in the temple cry "Hosanna to the Son of David," they resent this and say to Jesus: "Hearest thou what these say?"

There must be a reason why the leaders, who were practically unmoved by the miracles of Jesus, which certainly did not happen out of the public eye, try to snare Him not because of His works, but because of His words. In this respect TRAUB remarks that none of the miracles that Jesus performed were "special miracles" in the eyes of the Pharisees. They already had experience of such things. What they wanted was a very special sign, a "sign from heaven" (Mt. 16 : 1, Mk. 8 : 11), that would identify Jesus as the Messiah.²

¹ PERELS, *op. cit.*, p. 81. See the text of the story of R. Hanina ben Dosa and Igrat in FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 25 f. (see the chapter: The Healing of the Possessed).

² TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.* "In ihren Augen galten alle die wunderbaren

Doubtless the scribes also noted the miracles performed by the disciples, but these too belonged to the kind of powers that had been displayed before. For the miracles of the disciples were confined to healings, and since in general demons were regarded as disease-producers, there could be no difference for the leaders of the Jews between the deeds of the disciples and those of the Jewish exorcists.

Now we find a number of pointers in the Gospels. In Lk. 11 : 19 (Mt. 12 : 27) we find: "And if I by Beelzebub cast out devils, by whom do your sons cast them out? therefore shall they be your judges." Whom did Jesus mean by "your sons"? He cannot mean the disciples, since Jesus wishes to use the activities of these "sons" as a logical argument against the Pharisees. There are various views held, but from the text it is only possible to distil with certainty that by the "sons" Jesus had people in mind who were on an intimate footing with the Pharisees. The most obvious persons are pupils, as a result of which "your sons" approaches "you," i.e. "by whom do you yourselves cast them out?"¹ It cannot but strike us that Jesus does not criticize those that cast out devils. He says nothing about their methods or results.² He does not defend Himself by for His part accusing the sons of a pact with Beelzebub, no, He proclaims

Taten, die er tat, gar nicht als Extrawunder. So etwas hatten sie sonst auch erlebt. Sie strebten nach einem ganz besonderen Wunder, wodurch er sich als Messias erweisen sollte, etwa, dass er mit dem Hauch seines Mundes die Feinde erschläge, oder sich von der Zinne des Tempels herabliesse, oder Feuer und Schwefel regnen liess. Dann erst wollten sie glauben" (p. 26). "Von hier aus gewinnen wir allein einen Massstab für die zeitgenössische Beurteilung der Wunderberichte" (p. 28). FRIDRICHSEN, *Le Problème du Miracle*, p. 50: the opponents see no Messianic apodeixis in the miracles. STAUFFER, *Die Theologie des N.T.*, p. 153. Jewish realism demanded signs as legitimation: "vor dem Forum des AT und seiner amtlichen Exegeten."

¹ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, translates Mt. 12 : 27b as: "durch wen treiben eure Leute sie aus?" He does not envisage "sons" or "pupils", but Jewish exorcists (cf. Ac. 19 : 13; Flavius Josephus, *Antiq.*, VIII, II, 5). ALLEN, *St. Matthew*, translates as "your sons, which means 'people of your own race and religion,' i.e. Jews. It is here an Oriental circumlocution for 'you'." KEULERS, *Mattheüs*, has "pupils" in mind. HEMPEL, *Heilung als Symbol u. Wirklichkeit im bibl. Schrifttum*, remarks that these are not priests; they: "gehören zu der Gruppe freier Charismatiker" (p. 296).

² KEULERS, *Mattheüs*: "Jesus does not say whether they really cast out devils, or what power they used to do so. For the time being he adopts the attitude of the Pharisees, who approve of the conjurations by their pupils and certainly do not ascribe these to Satan's aid." EDELSHEIM, *Jesus the Messiah*, II, p. 198: "This mode of turning the argument against the arguer was peculiarly Hebraic, and it does not imply any assertion on the part of Christ, as to whether or not the disciples of the Pharisees really cast out demons."

them "judges;" it is these sons who "in practice refute your assertion."¹ Jesus' argument is effective only if the Pharisees approve of the exorcism performed by their sons. But if the pupils practised exorcism, why should the teachers not have done so too?

We believe that a following pointer is to be found in Mt. 12 : 10 and the parallel passages. The Pharisees ask Jesus whether it is lawful to heal on the Sabbath, so as to be able to accuse Him. What is at stake is therefore not the healing, but the question of the Sabbath! And the so-called Sabbath-breaking gives the Pharisees cause to seek Jesus' life. From the historical and psychological point of view the report as given here is acceptable only when the way in which Jesus healed was not regarded as "unusual." After all, the Pharisees are utterly lacking in respect for the "wonderful." This is still more evident in Lk. 13 : 10-17, the healing of the woman bowed together. The angry ruler of the synagogue says to the people concerning the healing: "There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath day," Lk. 13 : 14. Here, too, the "wonderful" aspect of the cure is completely ignored; in fact Jesus' healing is referred to as "work," which ought to be done on weekdays! Which can only confirm our view that the methods of healing used by Jesus and by the others tallied in many respects, whereby the results can be left out of consideration here.

A third pointer is to be found in Jn. 9 : 31. The healed blind man tells the Pharisees, who are questioning him for the second time: "Now we know that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth." These words contain the conditions which also held good for the miracle-working rabbis: piety and the fulfilment of righteousness, as a result of which one had a certain claim to having one's prayers answered.² The pronouncement of the man born blind only becomes

¹ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*: "sie widerlegen praktisch eure Behauptung" (Wellhausen).

² Berakoth 6b. "R. Helbo further said in the name of R. Huna: If one is filled with the fear of God his words are listened to. For it is said: The end of the matter, all having been heard: fear God, and keep his commandments, for this is the whole man (Eccl. XII, 13)" (ed. Epstein; transl. M. Simon). See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 534, who points to the saying: so-and-so was worthy of a miracle happening to him, e.g. Berak. 4a, Ta' anith 18b; Sanh. 94b. Everywhere here a certain degree of worthiness is presumed in those by or for whom a miracle will take place. Cf. BERTRAM, *TWNT*, III, p. 124 f. With regard to the person of the "intercessor" see DE BOER, *De Voorbede in het O.T.*, p. 157 ff. "The human intercessors are among the charismatic leaders of the people of Israel. They are pro-

really clear—note the significant beginning “we know”—when it is assumed that other rabbis were also engaging in healing in those days.

Finally we may point out that at the trial of Jesus the miracles were not discussed, whilst the Talmud denounces Jesus as a magician. If the Torah had been fully enforced, what would have been simpler than to make the miracles of Jesus one of the charges against Him? ¹

phets, priests or kings, and in an Ezra or a Nehemiah they are the substitutes for the royal leaders” (p. 160). The intercessor is the person “who can enter into communication with Jahweh, because he has received a part of His being. This distinguishes him from the ordinary believer.” Cf. JOHANSSON, *Parakletoi*, p. 3: “Die Fürbitte ist in der israelitischen Religion nicht Sache des gewöhnlichen Frommen, sondern eine Angelegenheit des Gottesmannes und Propheten.” But see p. 227: “Zu Jesu Zeiten war die Fürbitte seit langem Pflicht eines jeden Frommen. Es war nicht notwendig, dass der Mensch wie die Gottesmänner und Propheten des älteren Israel in einem besonderen Verhältnis zu Gott stand, damit die Fürbitte für andere wirksam sein konnte. Zwar ist uns kein Wort Jesu erhalten, das zur Fürbitte mahnte.” STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, I, 7. Exkurs: Das altjüdische Synagogeninstitut, C. Der Vorbeter, pp. 149-152. Cf. also EERDMANS, *The Religion of Israel*. “Prayer of prominent religious man, intercessory prayer, was believed to be of great influence” (p. 107).

¹ In a publication that appeared in 1957, “Jesus, Gestalt und Geschichte,” STAUFFER, with reference to the pronouncement in the Talmud (in *Sanh.* 43a; 107b; cf. *Sota* 47a): “Jesus practised sorcery and enticed Israel to apostacy,” states as his opinion: “Mancherlei Anzeichen sprechen dafür, dass diese Formel aus dem amtlichen Exekutionsbericht des Grossen Synhedriums vom Jahre 32 stammt (*Iustin Dial.*, 69, 7; 108, 2; u.a.m.).” (p. 19; cf. p. 73 and p. 81. See further STAUFFER, *Jerusalem u. Rom*, p. 113 ff.). Now the Gospels state that Jesus was accused of expelling the spirits “through the prince of the devils” (*Mt.* 9 : 34; 12 : 24; *Mk.* 3 : 22; *Lk.* 11 : 15; cf. also *Mt.* 27 : 63), but why is nothing said about this at the trial? With regard to *Sanh.* 43a (for the text of this, see the chapter: “Jewish Opinions on Jesus’ Miracles”), Stauffer remarks: “Man sieht, auch hier weiss man von dem Kausalzusammenhang zwischen Wundertätigkeit und Todesbeschluss, der in *J* 11, 46 f., betont wird” (p. 81; cf. p. 19: “Nach *J* 11, 47 f. ist Jesus gerade um seiner Wundertätigkeit willen als Volksverführer verhaftet und verurteilt worden.”) The word “Kausalzusammenhang” is confusing. For it is evident from *Jn.* 11 : 48 that it was not the signs as such, as “proofs” of “sorcery,” which interested or stirred the Sanhedrin—whilst somebody had after all been raised from the dead!—but the influence exerted by the person who performed the signs. They were afraid of their own loss of power and of political difficulties. See the accusation in *Lk.* 23 : 2! In this work we cannot go further into the trial of Jesus, but would refer to a pronouncement by HUSBAND, *The Prosecution of Jesus*. The Christians had bitter feelings against the Jews on account of the crucifixion of Jesus. The Jews tried to defend themselves. “Evidently the Jews soon felt that it was necessary to defend themselves against the charge of injustice, and many passages in the Talmud give convincing proof of this desire . . . The essential point to discover is the nature of the accusation which the writers of the Talmud thought could have been brought against Jesus” (p. 223). It is entirely comprehensible and clear that later in the rabbinical writings Jesus’ “sorcery” is also included among the charges. The indications in the

The fact that this was not done indicates that magical and miraculous practices were the order of the day and could not be used as the basis for a legal action, neither in the bosom of the Sanhedrin itself nor for the Roman governor.

In view of the above data from the New Testament we believe that Fiebig's viewpoint is in fact not as untenable as Schlatter and the others wish us to believe. SCHLATTER is right when he draws attention to the great difference existing between the miraculous power of Jesus and the miraculous practices of the rabbis, the latter having their origin in a theology of merit which taught that the prayer, through his righteousness, could assert a certain "right" vis-à-vis God.¹ However, the point at issue here is not this difference; there need be no doubt about the absolutely unique nature of the miracles of Jesus. Nor do we need to reflect here on the question of whether and to what extent the rabbinical miracle-workers had results.

The attitude of the Pharisees and the scribes towards the miracles of Jesus, an attitude that strikes us by its indifference and impassiveness, presents itself in a much clearer historical and psychological light if it is assumed that the rabbis in Jesus' days included miracle-workers who used to do their therapeutical "work" on weekdays.²

Gospels point straight in that direction. But this in no way proves that the Sanhedrin had already adduced Jesus' "sorcery" as incriminating evidence and incorporated it in its official verdict. After all, following is not the same as being a consequence! Nor could the Sanhedrin do anything with the insinuations of some witnesses during the trial in connection with Jesus' words about the destruction of the temple of God (Mt. 26 : 61-62; Mk. 14 : 57-59; 15 : 29, 30), although these words could possibly be interpreted as sorcery and sacrilege, which were subject to the death penalty . . . WINTER, *On the Trial of Jesus*, has tried to show that Jesus was condemned and killed for political reasons, which, however, "by no means proves that he did work for the overthrow of the existing political system" (p. 148). As regards Sanh. 43a, Winter remarks: "The charge of magic is legendary and developed during the second century among Jews who had heard from Christians something of what the Gospels report of Jesus' miracles. Not disposed to deny the veracity of miracle-stories, Jews attributed Jesus' marvellous deeds to magical arts" (p. 144). BLINZLER, *Der Prozess Jesu*, p. 131. "Der Vorwurf der Zauberei schliesslich spielt nur in gelegentlichen Äusserungen der Gegner Jesu während seines öffentlichen Wirkens (Mk 3, 22 Parr, Mt 9, 34) eine Rolle, nicht dagegen in der Gerichtsverhandlung. Dass ausser der Gotteslästerung noch ein anderes Delikt für das Todesurteil des Synedrums massgebend war, lässt sich also nicht aufrechterhalten."

¹ SCHLATTER, *op. cit.* The synagogue was dominated by "Verdiensttheologie." "Durch seine Gerechtigkeit hat der Beter ein Recht vor Gott" (p. 78).

² See the chapter: Jewish Opinions on Jesus' Miracles.

III. THE MIRACLES OF JESUS IN THE OLDEST TESTIMONIES

The number of old "witnesses" concerning Jesus is very small. MOREAU lists besides the Jewish sources nine Greek, Latin and Syriac sources, only four of which are of importance to our investigation.¹

(a) The first source is the Greek edition of the works of Flavius Josephus, the man "who always smacks of the Pharisee, the official historiographer and the courtier."² In his "The Jewish Antiquities" the following passage about Jesus appears:

"At that time lived Jesus, a wise man, if at least he may be called a man, for he did miraculous works and was the teacher of men who gladly receive the truth, and he attracted many Jews but also many from the Greek world. He was the Christ. And after he had been condemned to the cross by Pilate, on the complaint of the leading men of our people, those who had first loved him did not cease to love him. For he appeared to them on the third day, in life again, as the divine prophets had said, together with a thousand other marvellous things about him. And to the present day there are people called after him: the Christians."³

The question whether this celebrated Testimonium Flavianum is genuine or not is answered in various ways. There are certainly insuperable objections to the authenticity of the traditional version.⁴

¹ MOREAU, *Les plus anciens Témoignages profanes sur Jésus*. Cf. AUFHAUSER, *Antike Jesus-Zeugnisse*. In the five remaining testimonies, viz. the letter from Pliny to Trajan (*Epistolae*, lib. X; XCVI-XCVII); Tacitus' account (*Ann.*, XV, 44); the short notes by Suetonius (*Claudius*, cap. 25, 3, and *Nero*, cap. 16, 2); the letter from the Syrian Mara bar Serapion to his son Serapion and Thallus' account, nothing occurs of importance to our investigation. See MOREAU, *op. cit.*, p. 7 ff.

² MOREAU, *op. cit.*, p. 12, who refers to the work by G. Ricciotti on Flavius Josephus.

³ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, XVIII, III, 3.

⁴ Cf. on the problem of authenticity among others EISLER, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 2-88, who gives an extensive survey; KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 55 ff.; MOREAU, *op. cit.*, p. 11 ff.; HARTDORFF, *Historie of Historisiering*, p. 88 ff.; STELMA in Waszink et al., *Het oudste christendom en de Antieke Cultuur*, I, p. 583 ff.; VAN DER LOOS, *Jezus Messias- Koning*, p. 207 ff. In the reconstruction of the text as proposed by EISLER the wonderful element is additionally stressed: "Es wird aber um diese Zeit (zum Anlass neuer Unruhen) ein gewisser Jesu, ein weise (tuende)r Mann, wenn anders man ihn einen Mann nennen darf . . . (den ungeheuerlichsten aller Menschen,

However this may be, we cannot but be struck by the strength with which the wonderful nature of Jesus lived on in tradition.

Besides the "Greek" Josephus we have had since 1906 a "Slavonic" one, containing all kinds of details of John the Baptist and Jesus.¹ This version stresses Jesus' wonderful activities. "And all that he did by an invisible power he worked by word and command. . . And again: he did nothing shameful, nor did he work by means of his hands, but he did everything by word alone."

The leaders of the Jews lodged a complaint against Jesus with Pilate, but after a judicial examination Pilate said that Jesus was no "malefactor," but "a benefactor." "And he let him go, for he had healed his dying wife." When a second complaint was lodged against Jesus, Pilate handed Him over to the Jews.

(b) The correspondence between King Abgar of Edessa and Jesus.

This correspondence, unearthed and preserved by Eusebius, is doubtless a product of pious fancy.² Although not the slightest historical value can thus be attached to it, it is again a sign of the tradition about Jesus' miraculous power. The letter which Abgar sent to Jesus by the courier Ananias reads as follows: "Abgar Uchama, Ruler, greets Jesus, the good Saviour, who has appeared in the area of Jerusalem. I have heard speak of you and your cures, namely that these are done by you without medicines and herbs. For it is said that you make the blind see and the lame walk, that you heal lepers and cast out unclean spirits and devils, that you cure those who are tortured by protracted illness and that you raise the dead. And, having heard all this of you, I conceive of it as follows: it is one of two things—either you are God and, having descended from Heaven, do these things, or you do these things as the Son of God. And so I am writing to you now, and requesting you to take pains for me and heal me of the disease from which I suffer. For I have also heard that the Jews are grumbling at you and would harm

den seine Schüler einen Gottessohn nennen, der Wunder getan habe, wie sie noch niemals je ein Mensch getan hat!) . . . Er war nämlich ein Lehrer verblüffender Kunststücke für diejenigen Menschen, die mit Wonne das Ungewohnte aufnehmen," EISLER, *op. cit.*, I, p. 88.

¹ See BERENDTS-GRASS, *Vom jüdischen Kriege*, II, pp. 268-271. This text has also been corrected and supplemented by Eisler, cf. EISLER, *op. cit.*, II, p. 453 ff. Cf. among others VAN DER LOOS, *op. cit.*, p. 211 ff.; MOREAU, *op. cit.*, p. 25 ff.; LINDESKOG, *Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitl. Judentum*, p. 192 ff.

² EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, I, XIII, 1-22 . . . Eusebius is said to have derived the correspondence, which was written in Syrian, from the archives of the town of Edessa. Cf. MOREAU, *op. cit.*, p. 53 ff.

you. My city is small indeed, but grand; it will be enough for the two of us."

The same courier brought back the following answer from Jesus to Abgar: "Blessed be your lot, you who believed in me whilst you had not seen me. For it is written of me that those who have seen me shall not believe in me, so that those who have not seen me shall believe and live. Now, as regards your letter to me to come to you: it is necessary for me to fulfil all for which I have been sent hither, and after the fulfilment to be taken up to Him that sent me. And when I have been taken up, I shall send you one of my disciples so that he may heal you of your disease and shall give life both to you and to yours."

When the disciple promised by Jesus, Thaddeus, had come to Edessa, he performed many healing miracles. Summoned to Abgar, Thaddeus healed the believing ruler of his disease by the laying on of hands. Many citizens of Edessa were also cured of their diseases by the disciple. When Abgar tried to give him gifts of gold, Thaddeus refused them, saying: "If we have left our own possessions behind, how can we accept those of others?"

(c) From as far back as the second century so-called letters or reports written by Pilate are said to have circulated among the Christians, in which Pilate endeavoured to unburden himself to the Emperor of his remorse at having had Jesus crucified.¹ *Acta* or *Gesta Pilati* also appeared in pagan circles, but these were "full of blasphemies against Christ."² The result was that the Christians in

¹ See JUSTIN, *Apol.*, I, 35 and 48. According to STÜLCKEN it is very dubious whether Justin knew anything of the contents of the *Acta*, see HENNECKE, *Neutestam. Apokr.*, p. 77. TERTULLIAN, *Apologeticum*, XXI, 24, says that the contents of the *Acta Pilati* prove that "Pilate at heart was already a Christian" (*et ipse iam pro sua conscientia Christianus*) . . . What has been handed down to us of the *Acta* or *Gesta Pauli* dates from the fourth or fifth century. It has been preserved in the *Acta Petri et Pauli* and as an appendix to the *Evangelium Nicodemia*. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, gives a short summary of the essential content of the *Acta Pilati*, as published by Tischendorf, *Evang. Apocr.*³, pp. 210-432 (p. 187 ff.) . . . The *Ev. Petri*, 45, 46, describes how the soldiers guarding Jesus' tomb, after wonderful experiences, went in alarm to Pilate and said: "He was truly God's Son." Pilate replied, saying: "My hands are clean of the blood of the Son of God." This illustrates how the efforts to exonerate Pilate began at an early date.

² EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, IX, V, 1. These memorials had to be made known everywhere. "They then fabricated *Acta* of Pilate and of our Saviour, full of blasphemies against Christ, and on the orders of the ruler sent them throughout his empire with the written command that they be made known to everyone everywhere, in villages and towns, and that the schoolmasters there devote their

turn published new *Acta Pilati*, the preparation of which is known from, for instance, the Gospel of Nicodemus.

A letter which Pontius Pilate is said to have sent to Emperor Tiberius Caesar states that "a more pious and more serious man" than Jesus never lived, but that he, Pilate, handed this Jesus over to the Jews against his will for fear of the people revolting. In a letter which Pontius Pilate is alleged to have sent to his King Claudius (*sic!*), he states that it was seen "that he gave the blind sight, healed lepers, cured the lame, cast out demons from the possessed, even raised the dead, commanded the wind, walked dry of foot over the waves of the sea and performed many other miracles. But when the whole Jewish people said that he was the Son of God, the high priests were filled with envy. They took him prisoner and handed him over to me and, concocting the one lie after the other, they said that he was a magician and acted against their laws."

The report which Pontius Pilate, procurator of Judea, sent to Tiberius, Emperor of Rome, states that the whole Jewish people handed over to Pilate with many an accusation a man called Jesus. The report mentions that Jesus had performed many healings as good works. He gave the blind sight, cured lepers, raised the dead, and cured paralytics who could not move at all, who only had their voices and their skeletons left, but whom He gave the strength to walk and run by speaking a single word, etc. "But the Jews lodged a complaint against Jesus, because he did these things on the Sabbath. And with my own eyes I have seen him work greater miracles than the gods we worship."

Fearing a rebellion, Pilate had Jesus crucified. The report goes on to tell in detail of the miraculous signs said to have manifested themselves at Jesus' death.¹ The apocryphal nature of the three memorials of Pilate is very evident indeed.

(d) In the so-called letter of Lentulus, procurator of Jerusalem, addressed to the Roman senate, a personal description of Jesus is given, in which He is described as fair of countenance and venerable. This letter begins as follows: "In those days there appeared a man, and he lives still, great of power, called Jesus Christ. The people call him a prophet of truth, while his disciples call him the Son of

attention to them instead of the mathematical subjects and cause them to be learned by heart." See also I, IX, 2, 3. — See BLINZLER, *Der Prozess Jesu*, p. 29 f.

¹ In MOREAU, *op. cit.*, p. 57 ff., the *Acta Pilati* may be found in the original texts, followed by a French translation.

God. He brings the dead back to life and heals all diseases." The letter goes on to give a detailed description of Jesus' fair appearance, whilst His manner is characterized as venerable and strict, but at the same time as charitable and lovable.

As no Governor Lentulus ruled Jerusalem in the days of Jesus, and the whole "portrait" has the appearance of fiction, the historical value of this letter may be put at zero.¹

If we survey the above data from the oldest testimonies, we arrive at extremely meagre results from the strictly historical point of view. Nothing definite can be said about the authors, about the dates, about the question of when, where and to what extent insertions and forgeries occurred, etc. And yet, having regard to the spirit and the intellectual climate of what was written, a certain value may be attached to these witnesses. There is an unmistakable connection with the information given by the Gospels. As regards Jesus' person, they tally with one another to the extent that He was "more" than a man, and possessed wonderful powers. As regards the miracles, we may mention the following. It was a thorn in the flesh of the Jews that Jesus also performed these miracles on the Sabbath. From the extensive description given in Pontius Pilate's report to Tiberius of a number of healings—Lazarus, the possessed, the woman with an issue of blood—it may be concluded that these healings excited the public mind. Were they perhaps a preferred means of propagating the Christian faith?

In its way, therefore, the oldest testimonies bear witness to the fact that the tradition of Jesus' wonderful activities was firmly anchored.

¹ MOREAU, *op. cit.*, p. 65 ff. Cf. AUFHAUSER, *op. cit.*, p. 37. EISLER reversed this description of Jesus and so adapted it to his own view of Him.

IV. JEWISH OPINIONS ON JESUS' MIRACLES

The number of Jewish scholars who, from the beginning of the Christian era up to the present day, have concerned themselves with the life and works of Jesus of Nazareth is not inconsiderable. On many occasions Jewish leaders were obliged to defend themselves in disputations with Christian theologians in which the obvious and the veiled pronouncements on Jesus in the Talmud repeatedly came to the fore. The fact that it is only some ten years ago that another two important studies were published on this subject is clear enough proof of its continuing topicality.¹ Christians cannot but be struck by the fact that Jewish circles try to lessen the antagonism in all kinds of ways and to prove in strictly scientific fashion that many passages in the Talmud which are believed by a large number of theologians to relate to the person of Jesus and the Christian faith do not in fact refer to these.

Quite apart from the question whether, on the strength of the information in the Talmud, Jesus may or may not be regarded as a historical figure, the first fact to be borne in mind is that Jesus is regarded as an ordinary human being.² He was neither the Son of

¹ J. Z. LAUTERBACH, *Rabbinic Essays*, 1951. The last chapter, pp. 473-570, is devoted to the subject of "Jesus in the Talmud". M. GOLDSTEIN, *Jesus in the Jewish Tradition*, 1950. Morris Goldstein also includes the "Post-Talmudic period" in his survey; however, this part is dealt with very briefly, and therefore suffers in clarity. See also M. AVI YONAH, *Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter des Talmud*.

² LAUTERBACH, *op. cit.*: "The references and allusions to Jesus found in the Talmud and in the Midrashim are of such a nature that they cannot be considered convincing proof that he actually existed. For, as will be shown, not even one *single statement* preserved to us in the talmudic-midrashic literature can be regarded as authentic in the sense that it originated in the time of Jesus or even in the first half century of the Christian era . . . In other words, the Talmud does not furnish any contemporary evidence for the historicity of Jesus. The references to Jesus recorded in the Talmud are mostly from teachers who lived a long time after Jesus." The rabbis heard the stories, came into contact with Christians and discussed Jesus. "They never argued the question whether such a figure had actually existed or not, since Christianity was an actual reality. They probably were not even interested in this question" (p. 477 f.). TRAVERS HERFORD, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, believes on the other hand that the rabbinical writings are independent and inimical testimony that "Jesus of Nazareth really existed, a fact which has by some been called in question" (p. 359 f.). See for a survey of the pros and cons of the historical value of the Talmudic data on Jesus: HARTDORFF, *Historie of Historisiering*, pp. 94-101. Hartdorff's conclusion is: "The Talmud can never be used as an argument for the radical hypothesis, since

God nor the promised Messiah. Who and what He then was depends on the views of the Jewish writer, and these views depend in turn on the degree of theological knowledge, critical insight and personal likes or dislikes of the author. The extent to which the "Jewish question," with its numerous difficult points and tragic aspects, may have affected opinions about Jesus forms a problem in itself.¹

When Jesus of Nazareth is regarded as an "ordinary" man, one question springs to mind immediately: by what power did He perform His many miracles?²

The Jewish leaders denied that the God of Israel had called Him. How, then, did Jesus acquire this power? We already find in the Gospels the beginning of that thread which runs throughout old Jewish literature, viz. the pronouncement of the Pharisees: "He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils," Mt. 9 : 34.³

it is certain that the historicity of Jesus is not denied here." . . . As regards Jewish opinions on the historicity of Jesus, see LINDESKOG, *Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitl. Judentum*, p. 202 ff., Ch. IX, *Das Problem der Historizität*.

¹ Cf. the interesting book by JULES ISAAC, *Jésus et Israël* . . . Isaac introduces his "Vingt et unième et ultime proposition" with the words: "Quels que soient les péchés d'Israël, il est innocent, pleinement innocent des crimes dont l'accuse la tradition chrétienne: il n'a pas rejeté Jésus, il ne l'a pas crucifié. Et Jésus non plus n'a pas rejeté Israël, ne l'a pas maudit: de même que 'les dons de Dieu sont sans repentance' (Romains, XI, 29), de même l'évangélique Loi d'amour est sans exception. Puissent les Chrétiens le reconnaître enfin, reconnaître et réparer leurs criantes iniquités. A l'heure présente où une malédiction semble peser sur l'humanité tout entière, c'est le devoir pressant que leur dicte la méditation d'Auschwitz" (p. 555). Isaac wrote his book between 1943 and 1946 . . . Quite different in form is the work by EDMOND FLEG, *Jésus raconté par le Juif errant*. He asks himself: "Quel fut, quel est encore Jésus pour Israël? Quel secret, tout à la fois, les sépare et les unit? Si le Nazaréen venait accomplir l'idée juive, pourquoi les Juifs l'ont-ils rejeté? S'il venait l'abolir, pourquoi lui ont-ils survécu?" (p. 9). See further the illuminating argument by SCHOEPS, *Jüdisch-christliches Religionsgespräch in 19 Jahrhunderten*. MISKOTTE, *Het wezen der joodsche religie*. See p. 10 f.; p. 191 ff. (Hermann Cohen); p. 384 ff. (Ernst Bloch); p. 393 ff. (Constantin Buber). BONSTRVEN, *Les Juifs et Jésus* . . . A fascinating and instructive work on Judaism was published in 1959 by W. HERBERG, *Judaism and Modern Man. An Interpretation of Jewish Religion*. He makes the following noteworthy statement: "There is no Judaism without Abraham and Moses, without Egypt and Sinai; there is no Christianity without these and without Jesus and Calvary in addition" (p. 261).

² JUSTIN, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 67. The Jew Trypho charges the Christians with returning to Greek mythology by their belief in the virgin birth of Christ. You should be ashamed, says Trypho: "and rather say that this Jesus was born as a man of men . . ." We find the same view held by the Gnostic Cerinthus, see IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, I, 26, 1: Jesus was "a son born of Joseph and Mary, in the same way as all other men" (*fuisse autem eum Joseph et Mariae filium similiter ut reliqui omnes homines*).

³ Cf. Mt. 12 : 24; Mk. 3 : 22; Lk. 11 : 15. In this last text it is "some of

By these words Jesus' work was branded as unlawful. This is the phenomenon that we encounter everywhere and at all times: the "lawfulness" of a person's religious thought and actions is judged by what a religion professes in its lawful form adopted and recognized by the official leaders. This becomes strikingly clear in the discussion between the Pharisees and the man born blind who was cured by Jesus. The Pharisees say that they are disciples of Moses: "We know that God spake unto Moses: as for this fellow, we know not from whence he is," Jn 9 : 29. Jesus' activities were not lawful! A striking example from the Old Testament is the following. Moses and the magicians of Egypt performed the same actions with their rods, but those of the Egyptians were described as "enchantments," Ex. 7 : 10-12.¹ Now Jesus is nowhere called a sorcerer or magician in so many words, but the view that Jesus cast out the devils through Beelzebub is an obvious pointer towards this opinion, which we encounter at a very early stage both in the Talmud and in the disputations between Christians and Jews in old Christian literature.

Let us begin with the Talmud. It must be stated at the outset that it is extremely difficult to work with the "references" in the Talmud, for three reasons. In the first place we no longer possess a "pure" Talmud. At certain points which concerned the person of Jesus Christ, His doctrine and His followers, the Talmud has been censored by both the Christians and the Jews themselves, especially since the thirteenth century. "This has made it impossible to give an exact answer about the original state of affairs, or at least made an approximate answer very difficult," says STRACK.² In the second

them" (of the people) who say that Jesus casts out devils through Beelzebub.

¹ Cf. Ex. 7 : 22; 8 : 7. On the basis of the legitimate nature of their having been sent forth by Jesus Christ, Barnabas and Saul consider the Jew Bar-jesus, whom they find at Paphos on Cyprus, "a sorcerer, a false prophet", Ac. 13 : 6; cf. verse 10!

² STRACK, *Jesus, die Häretiker u. die Christen*, p. 3. LAUTERBACH, *op. cit.*, p. 475. GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*: "As a result of the twofold censorship the usual volumes of rabbinic literature contain only a distorted remnant of supposed allusions to Jesus" (p. 4). Goldstein characterizes the 13th century as "a century which brought untold misery to the Jews in Spain and France by reason of supposed Talmudic reflections upon Jesus." In 1240 the Pope commanded the authorities in Spain, France, Portugal and England to investigate Jewish literature for accounts of Jesus (p. 197). Goldstein reckons "the medieval period" as having lasted an extensive length of time for the Jews, viz. from Constantine the Great to 1776 or 1791: the Declaration of the Rights of Man (pp. 144 and 221). Cf. LINDESKOG, *op. cit.*, p. 17 ff., "Jesus in der mittelalterlichen Literatur des Judentums." SCHOEPS, *op. cit.*, p. 62 ff. J. L. PALACHE, *Inleiding in de Talmoed*, pp.

place the great space of time over which the Rabbinica were written, viz. from about 400 B.C. to 500-600 A.D., presents great difficulties. For we are faced with the following problem: when did the authors who possibly reported something about Jesus live, by whom were they informed, and was this information reliable? The third difficulty concerns the various names which might have been given to Jesus. Do the passages which speak of Yeshu, Balaam Ben Stada, Ben Pandera, "so-and-so", Josos and Ben Netzer refer to Jesus or to other persons? Opinions on this are greatly divided. Consequently the whole matter seems highly problematical. And, moreover, a distinction has to be made between the accounts from the days of the Tannaim, i.e. the teachers of the Mishnaic period up to about 225 A.D., and those of the Amoraim, who are the authorities on the subject of the Gemara and whose period extends into the sixth century.¹

Confining ourselves to those pronouncements relevant to our subject, we may quote the following from the period of the Tannaim: (a) "Yeshu of Nazareth" was hanged on the day of preparation for the Passover (or for the Sabbath) because he had "practised sorcery" and had led the people astray.² GOLDSTEIN says of this account: "This appears to be definite testimony in the early rabbinic data."³

1-8. Pope Honorius IV, writing in 1286 to the Archbishop of Canterbury, called the Talmud a "liber damnabilis" . . . The Jewish scholar Constantin Brunner makes a remarkable pronouncement when he says that he finds it difficult to bear the Talmud, since it either ignores or libels Christ. Christ is to the rabbis as Socrates to the sophists; see MISKOTTE, *Het wezen der joodsche religie*, p. 402.

¹ GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, says that the mistake made by H. Laible and Travers Herford was that they did not sufficiently subdivide the material from the Talmud into early and late material (p. 107). He himself makes a definite distinction between a "Tannaic period" and an "Amoraic period."

² Sanhedrin 43a. "It was taught: On the eve of the Passover Yeshu was hanged. For forty days before the execution took place, a herald went forth and cried, 'He is going forth to be stoned because he has practised sorcery and enticed Israel to apostasy. Any one who can say anything in his favour, let him come forward and plead on his behalf.' But since nothing was brought forward in his favour he was hanged on the eve of the Passover . . . Ulla retorted: Do you suppose that he was one for whom a defence could be made? Was he not a Mesith (enticer), concerning whom Scripture says, Neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him? ¹) With Yeshu, however, it was different, for he was connected with the government (or royalty, i.e. influential)" (Ed. Epstein; transl. Shachter).

³ GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 22. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 27, says that this baraita is "of greater historical value" (than Sanh. 107b). However, cf. WINTER, *On the Trial of Jesus*, p. 144, on Sanh. 43a: "The evidential value of the baraita for historical purposes is nil."

¹) Deu. XIII, 9.

He points out that in those days magical practices were not unusual and that there were men with seats in the Sanhedrin who were acquainted with magic and capable of unmasking magicians.¹ He then concludes that this statement was a means of expressing the fact that in those days Judaism did not accept the religion of Jesus.²

(b) Rabbi Eliezer ben Dama had been bitten by a snake. He was offered healing in the name of "Yeshu ben Pandera." Upon his accepting, he died.³ It may be derived from this account that it was also the custom in those days to heal in the name of Yeshu ben Pandera. Although there are various conjectures about the derivation and meaning of this name, it may be assumed that Yeshu ben Pandera does in fact mean Jesus.⁴

(c) A number of texts occur in the Talmud which describe the vicissitudes of a certain Ben Stada. This Ben Stada is said to have brought "sorceries from Egypt," i.e. magic spells, by means of incisions in his body. It was forbidden to make copies of these magic spells in the Egyptian library, and so Ben Stada had "tattooed" them (Lauterbach) on his body and brought them with him in that way. Various scholars identify this Ben Stada with Jesus, but there is insufficient certainty to justify conclusions being drawn.⁵

¹ GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, "It is, in fact, told in the Talmud: 'Into the Sanhedrin are brought none other than those wise and acquainted with magic'" (B. Sanhedrin 17a; B. Menahoth 65a). "Rashi, in his interpretative comment, many centuries later explained the requisite: it was in order that the members of the Sanhedrin should be capable of exposing magicians and sorcerers" (p. 27).

² GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.* "This, therefore, was but another way of saying that Judaism in Tannaitic times did not accept the religion based on Jesus" (p. 27).

³ Tosephta Hullin, II, 22-23: "It happened to R. Eliezer ben Dama (son of R. Ishmael's sister)¹) that a serpent bit him; and Jacob of Kefar Sama (Sekanya) came to heal him in the name of Yeshu ben Pandera. But R. Ishmael forbade him. He said, Ben Dama, you are not permitted! He (R. Eliezer ben Dama) answered, I will bring thee a proof that he may heal me (I will bring thee a verse from the Law showing that it is permitted). But ere he could bring a proof he died. R. Ishmael said (called to him): Happy art thou, Ben Dama, that thou hast gone in peace (that thy body is clean and thy soul has gone forth in purity) and hast not broken down the fence of the Wise."

⁴ Yeshu ben Pantera; Yeshu ben Pandera; Ben Pandera; Bar Pandera; Yeshu Pandera . . . LAUTERBACH, *op. cit.*, says that "fanciful interpretations" have been given of the meaning of this name (p. 536). "Perhaps, however, we need no interpretation beyond the simple interpretation that Panther was just a name or still better a family name" (p. 536). Cf. STRACK, *op. cit.*, p. 21, note 3. GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 39. Goldstein thinks that "Yeshu ben Pantera was given simply as a family name of Jesus in its earlier mention in the Talmud."

⁵ The references are: Bab. Sabbath 104b; Bab. Sanhedrin 67a; Tosephta

¹) Bracketed words are from the version in Ab. Zar. 27b; the rest from T. Hullin, II, 22-23; see KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 40.

- (d) In a series of texts Balaam is mentioned. He is described as a godless man, a fraud and a magician, who was lame and who was killed at the age of thirty-three.¹ According to various scholars, Balaam means Jesus, if not in all passages then certainly in some. Others claim that the soothsayer Balaam from the Old Testament is meant, or possibly someone of the Balaam type.²
- (e) A number of texts refer to "so-and-so" who was entered as a bastard in a genealogical register at Jerusalem.³ It is dubious whether the person of Jesus is meant by this bastard.
- (f) At the end of an account of a conflict between R. Joshua ben Peraḥiah and his pupil Jesus—arising out of a misplaced remark by this Jesus—it is stated that a teacher said: Jesus did magic and misled Israel.⁴ Nothing certain can be said about the identity of

Sabbath, XI, 15; Pal. Sabbath, XII, 4; Tosephta Sanhedrin, X, II; Pal. Sanhedrin, VII, 16; Pal. Jebamoth, XVI, 6 (here the name is Ben Satra). . . . It was established at quite an early date (by Rabbi Tam in the 12th century; by Rabbi Yehiel in 1240 during a celebrated disputation in Paris) that Ben Stada and Jesus are not identical. Surmises are: Ben Stada = James, the brother of the Lord; Simon Magus, who called himself the "stadios," the eternally standing one; the Egyptian false prophet mentioned by Flavius Josephus. LAUTERBACH is of the opinion that the spelling Ben Satada or Ben Sateda must be replaced by Ben Sarata, in which "Ben" has the meaning of "expert". "Ben Sarata then means an adept at tattooing or an expert tattooer" (op. cit., p. 517). According to LAUTERBACH there is only in Tos. Sanhedrin 67a: "a suggestion that it refers to Jesus who was sentenced and crucified on the eve of Passover" (p. 518). Cf. GOLDSTEIN, op. cit., p. 61.

¹ Mishna Sanhedrin, X, 2; P. Aboth, V, 19; Bab. Sanhedrin 106b and 106a concl.; Jalkuth Shimeoni par. 766 in Num. XXIII, 7.

² LAUTERBACH, op. cit., p. 503 ff. Lauterbach concludes: "And we still have to find proof for the statement that Balaam was used as an epithet for Jesus" (p. 514). GOLDSTEIN, op. cit., reproaches Herford with building up "quite a picture of the 'violence of the hatred' of the Talmudic Jews against Jesus" (p. 64). Goldstein thinks of Balaam from the Old Testament. "He became the 'horrible example' in Jewish tradition even as he did in Christian tradition" (p. 66).

³ Yebamoth 49a. "Said R. Simeon B. 'Azzai: I found a roll of genealogical records in Jerusalem, and therein was written, so-and-so is a bastard (having been born) from (a forbidden union with) a married woman, which confirms the view of R. Joshua" (ed. Epstein; transl. W. Slotki). Cf. M. Yebam., 4, 13; Yebam., 66b. . . . According to Derenbourg, Krauss, Laible, Herford, Klausner and others this "so-and-so" means Jesus; according to others it does not; see for instance DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 4, note 2.

⁴ SANHEDRIN 107b (in Epstein in a footnote, introduced by "II Kings V, 27. The uncensored edition continues, etc.") "And a Master has said 'Jesus the Nazarene practised magic and led Israel astray'." Here Jesus is represented as a contemporary of King Jannai (104-78 B.C.E.). See HERFORD, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, p. 50 ff. Cf. Sotah 47a. In Pal. Hagiga, II, 2, an almost identical story occurs, in which a pupil of Rabbi Jehuda ben Tabai committed the same fault as Jesus did with regard to Joshua ben Peraḥiah.

the Jesus mentioned, but it may be assumed that this is a reference to the "magical practices" of which Jesus of Nazareth is always accused.¹

This concludes the accounts from the Tannaitic period of importance to our investigation. GOLDSTEIN considers it extremely important that people be prepared to accept arguments that the names Ben Stada, Balaam, "so-and-so", Josos, etc., do not relate to Jesus, since confusion on this point has caused so much trouble.² With reference to a typical Baraita, i.e. a tradition outside the canon, GOLDSTEIN makes a number of noteworthy remarks on the attitude adopted in the days of the Tannaim towards miracles. Rabbi Elieser, who lived in about 90-130 A.D.,³ performed a number of startling miracles to support his opinions. However, the Tannaim would not allow themselves to be convinced by these miracles.⁴ GOLDSTEIN considers

¹ GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 73: this statement cannot refer to Jesus. LAUTERBACH, *op. cit.*, p. 481 ff.: this is a legend. "To sum up, then, the story in b. Sanhedrin is a later legend about Jesus and not a contemporary report, not even a reliable tradition . . ." (p. 490).

² GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 94 f. Cf. LAUTERBACH, *op. cit.* "Some modern scholars are so eager to discover allusions to Jesus, that at an allusion in the Talmud to any person in whose history or character there is the slightest hint or a resemblance to one feature or another in the life story of Jesus, they immediately jump to the conclusion that the person referred to was Jesus presented under some disguise" (p. 543).

³ See FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 31, who refers to STRACK, *Einl.*, p. 87.

⁴ Baba Mezi'a 59b. With regard to a discussion about the oven of 'Aknai. "It has been taught: On that day R. Eliezer brought forward every imaginable argument, but they did not accept them. Said he to them: 'If the halachah agrees with me, let this carob-tree prove it!' Thereupon the carob-tree was torn a hundred cubits out of its place—others affirm, four hundred cubits. 'No proof can be brought from a carob-tree,' they retorted. Again he said to them: 'If the halachah agrees with me, let the stream of water prove it!' Whereupon the stream of water flowed backwards. 'No proof can be brought from a stream of water,' they rejoined. Again he urged: 'If the halachah agrees with me, let the walls of the schoolhouse prove it,' whereupon the walls inclined to fall. But R. Joshua rebuked them, saying: 'When scholars are engaged in halachic dispute, what have ye to interfere?' Hence they did not fall, in honour of R. Joshua, nor did they resume the upright, in honour of R. Eliezer; and they are still standing thus inclined. Again he said to them: 'If the halachah agrees with me, let it be proved from Heaven!' Whereupon a Heavenly Voice cried out: 'Why do ye dispute with R. Eliezer, seeing that in all matters the halachah agrees with him?' But R. Joshua arose and exclaimed: 'It is not in heaven.' ¹) What did he mean by this? . . . Said R. Jeremiah: That the Torah had already been given at Mount Sinai; we pay no attention to a Heavenly Voice, because Thou hast long since written in the Torah at Mount Sinai, After the majority must one incline. ²)

R. Nathan met Elijah ³) and asked him: What did the Holy One, Blessed be He,

¹) Deu. XXX, 12. ²) Ex. XXIII, 2. ³) It was believed that Elijah, who had never died, often appeared to the Rabbis.

this passage important. "Its significance in relation to our theme is the fact that the Tannaim refused to heed signs and miracles in seeking to comprehend the will of God expressed in the Torah and to crystallize it in religious practice laid down in rabbinic law. The Talmud record regarding miracles is at first somewhat puzzling. — Of interest to us is the fact that while saintly Sages were regarded as having performed wondrous deeds, recourse was never had to miracles to prove the truth of a religious doctrine. The attempt by R. Elieser was the single exception, and he was squelched by R. Joshua."

GOLDSTEIN points out that this behaviour towards Rabbi Elieser—note the time in which he lived, viz. 100 A.D.—"is a contradiction" of what Mt. 12 : 39 and I Co. 1 : 22 say about the Jews "seeking after" or "requiring" signs! "The miracles of the Old Testament stood in a class by themselves." Other miracles were judged by the standards of Deu. 13 : 2-6, viz. as a temptation to turn away from the God of Israel. "Thus we have already seen that the Tannaim looked upon Jesus as one who practised sorcery and led the people astray." According as Christianity laid more stress on the wonderful birth, the resurrection and the miracles of Jesus, rabbinical Judaism regarded the miracles as subordinate.¹

The sovereignty and absolute nature of the Torah are very strikingly underlined here, while at the same time more light is cast on the indifferent attitude adopted by the Jewish leaders towards the miracles of Jesus. But at the same time we find in GOLDSTEIN's remark that Rabbinical Judaism gradually put miracles "into a subsidiary category" a confirmation of our belief that in Jesus' day, too, there were rabbis who performed miracles. For it is most difficult to imagine that towards the end of the first century A.D. miracles were ascribed to rabbis such as Elieser and Joshua whilst this was not the case prior to then.²

The second period, that of the Amoraim, extended over a fairly

do in that hour? . . . He laughed (with joy), he replied, saying, 'My sons have defeated Me, My sons have defeated Me.' It was said: On that day all objects which R. Eliezer had declared clean were brought and burnt in fire. Then they took a vote and excommunicated him" (Ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman).

¹ GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 92 f.: "Moreover, as Christianity emphasized more and more the miracles of the Birth and Resurrection of Jesus and his wondrous acts, rabbinic Judaism correspondingly placed miracles into a subsidiary category, minimizing their place, after Old Testament times, in the revelation of religious truth. From this we may infer definitely an indirect allusion to Jesus."

² See the chapter: Magical and Miraculous Practices of the Jews in Jesus' Day.

long period of time.¹ From this period date various allusions to Jesus and the Minim.²

- (a) Healings were performed in the name of Jesus Pandira.³ This shows, says GOLDSTEIN, that even in later times—Rabbi Joshua ben Levi lived in Palestine in the first half of the third century—there were Jews who, for healing, had recourse to the name of Jesus, and it also demonstrates that it was the healing power of Jesus which had made the deepest impression.⁴ The opposition of the rabbis in those days was more violent than at the time of the Tannaim.
- (b) A number of accounts refer to Balaam, Ben Netzer and Joshua.⁵

¹ GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 107: "The research into the Amoraic period takes cognizance of the Amoraim, who are the Gemara Authorities of the third, fourth, fifth and—including the Saboraim—the sixth centuries." Their work was continued in the Responsa of the Geonim up to the middle of the 11th century. There nothing is said about Jesus, except by Saadia Gaon.

² It is difficult to decide who exactly is meant by the Minim. The derivation of the word is also uncertain. Surmises are: 1. The word min is related to an Arabic verb meaning "to lie"; 2. min, מין = kind, nature; 3. min = a contraction of the verb for "to believe"; 4. min is formed from initials meaning: "believing in Jesus the Nazarene"; 5. min is derived from Manes, the founder of Manicheism; 6. min comes from the verb "to deny". Cf. in extenso TRAVERS HERFORD, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*, p. 362 ff. Herford himself believes Minim to be derived from the Hebrew min = kind. SCHÜRER, *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, II, p. 463, note 139, says that the Minim are "apostates" as such and: "nicht lediglich die Judenchristen, wie oft angenommen wird." STRACK, *op. cit.*, p. 47, also derives Min from min, Greek γένος, kind. He distinguishes between three kinds, minim, viz. Jewish Minim in the pre-Christian era; Jewish Minim in the post-Christian era; Jewish Christians. GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 128: the Minim could be Jewish Christians, but they did not always need to be so. JOCZ, *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ*, pp. 174-190.

³ Midr. Ecclesiastes, X, 5: "The son of R. Joshua b. Levi had a choking fit. He went and brought one of (the followers of Bar Pandira) ¹) to relieve his choking. (R. Joshua) asked him, 'What did you pronounce over (my son)?' He replied, '(I quoted) one text after another.' ²) He exclaimed, 'Better that he had been buried and you had not quoted these texts over him.' And so it was to him like an error which proceedeth from a ruler, (for his son died)" (ed. Freedman-Simon; transl. A. Cohen).

⁴ GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 114. Cf. p. 137: "We learn that in the time of the Amoraim healing was still performed by the followers of the Nazarene, who whispered something of Jesus. This is added evidence that the curative powers of Jesus had made a lasting impression, much more than his teaching: Yet, now we find reference to his teaching, too. He is pictured as a Jew who taught Jewish doctrine and observance, but who 'burned the food'—'enticing many to heresy'."

⁵ B. Sanhedrin 106a; P. Berakoth, I, 8 or III, c. B. Kethuboth 51b, on Ben

¹) The words in brackets are omitted from the text from fear of the censor, Bar Pandira being Jesus.

²) Scriptural verses used to be cited as incantations. R. Joshua disapproved of the practice . . . See STRACK, *Jesus, die Häretiker* u. d. Christen, p. 45, for parallel passages.

It is dubious whether these are allusions to Jesus of Nazareth, and in any case the accounts are irrelevant to our investigation.

GOLDSTEIN mentions a number of texts which demonstrate that the significance of miracles in Judaism gradually lost strength.¹ He sees in this on the one hand an evolution of Judaism, and on the other hand a certain indirect opposition on the part of the Jews to the wonderful nature of Jesus' person and works.² It is true that in the period of the Amoraim we encounter less direct and less important references to the person of Jesus, but "the indirect allusions, as a possible reply to Christian doctrine and conduct, become more abundant and more vital in rabbinic Judaism."³

These, then, were the data from the Talmud. But our knowledge of Jewish opinions on the person and the miracles of Jesus in the first centuries of the Christian era can be supplemented from another source. Very soon the Christian theologians had to defend themselves against the Jews. JUSTIN MARTYR (d. 165) recalls that the Jews at the time of Jesus, although they saw the works of Christ happening, claimed that a magic apparition had occurred, and "dared declare that he was a magician and a seducer of the people."⁴ In the celebrated "Treatise against Celsus," by ORIGEN, the philosopher Celsus, adopting the point of view of the Jews, engages in violent polemics against the Christian faith. Celsus lets the Jew put forward his ar-

Netzer; B. Sanhedrin 93a, on Joshua. According to GOLDSTEIN, op. cit., p. 123, neither Ben Netzer nor Joshua relates to Jesus of Nazareth.

¹ GOLDSTEIN, op. cit., p. 135: Pesikta Rabbati, p. 152a: "(Joshua ben Levi quoted a teaching of Hillel) The giving to man of his daily bread is as wonderful a marvel as the dividing of the Red Sea." Other references which mention Moses' great power are: Midrash Psalms on Ps. 145 : 1, p. 267b, Buber ed.; Midrash, Leviticus Rabbah, I, 14; Midrash, Deuteronomy Rabbah, VIII, 6.

² GOLDSTEIN, op. cit., p. 136: "That the motivation of this attitude was a part of the evolution of Judaism is certain, but it may be assumed that it was indirectly, in some degree, a position taken against the Christian emphasis upon the miraculous nature of Jesus."

³ GOLDSTEIN, op. cit., p. 139 . . . Cf. LINDESKOG, Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitl. Judentum, pp. 11 ff. and 184 ff., "Jesus in der rabbinischen Literatur." "Zusammenfassend können wir sagen: Die Stellung des Judentums zum Christentum in den ersten Jahrhunderten ist durchaus Abwehr und Angriff. Es bestreitet die Ansprüche der Kirche auf das Alte Testament" (p. 14 f.).

⁴ JUSTIN, Dial. cum. Tryph., cap. 69: καὶ γὰρ μάγον εἶναι αὐτὸν ἐτόλμων λέγειν καὶ λαοπλάνον. See also cap. 17, 108 and 117; see STRACK, op. cit., p. 8 f. . . . Of the "Altercatio Iasonis et Papisci" of Aristos (ca. 140 A.D.) only a few remnants are extant; see LINDESKOG, op. cit., p. 10. SCHNEIDER, Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums, p. 585 ff. Schneider says: "Den Kampf zwischen Christentum und Judentum hat das Judentum angefangen" (p. 585). See also GOPPELT, Christentum u. Judentum; III. Justin, p. 284 ff.

guments and grievances against Jesus. One of these is that Jesus appropriated to Himself in Egypt a power through which He "rose, so that he thought highly of himself and, on account of those powers, proclaimed himself God."¹ ORIGEN never tires of repeating and disproving over and over again the blasphemous allegation that Jesus performed His miracles by witchcraft.² Pionius, who died as a martyr in 250, states that according to the Jews Christ practised necromancy, and that He was resurrected after His crucifixion by that art.³ TERTULLIAN reports that the Jews did not repulse and persecute Christ in His capacity of some god or the

¹ ORIGEN, c. Celsum, I, 28. Celsus takes the part of a Jew and has him conduct a conversation with Jesus. The Jew scorns Jesus and says among other things that Jesus' mother, "cast out by the man and wandering round dishonourably, secretly bore Jesus and that he, after having gone to Egypt through want to find work, and after having been tested there on certain powers in which the Egyptians glory, rose through these powers, so that he thought highly of himself and, on account of those [powers], proclaimed himself God." Cf. I, 38; I, 46 . . . Cf. GOPPELT, *Christentum u. Judentum. Anhang: Celsus über das Verhältnis von Christentum und Judentum*, p. 280 ff.

² ORIGEN, c. Celsum, I, 6: "Thereafter, moved by I know not what, Celsus says that the Christians are strong through the names and the enchantments of certain demons . . . Then he further laid it to the Saviour's charge that he, enabled to do so by sorcery, had performed the fancied miraculous feats and foreseen that others would do the same if they had learned the same lessons, boasting that they did it through the power of God. These would dislodge Jesus from his position." Cf. I, 68 (Celsus, having once assumed that Jesus' miracles were in fact performed, puts them on a par with the works of the magicians). I, 71: "Thereupon the one who so to say is hated by God on account of his godlessness and his wretched tenets [Celsus], slandering Jesus, says that these [teachings] are those of one or the other wretched sorcerer hated by God." II, 9: according to Celsus Jesus performed His miracles by sorcery (γοητεία); ditto in II, 14; II, 16; II, 44; II, 48; II, 49 (Celsus puts Jesus' miraculous signs on a par with those among men); II, 51 (Origen defends himself against Celsus as follows: "And as a wolf is not the same as a dog, although it seems to have something similar in its posture and its sound, and a wood-pigeon is not [the same] as an [ordinary] pigeon, so that which is brought about by the might of God has nothing in common with the product of sorcery." In III, 1, Celsus says that there is nothing respectable in the dispute between Jews and Christians. For the Christians believe that the predicted Saviour has come, and the Jews do not believe this. Origen points out that the Jews once attacked Jesus Himself and that the Jews now living "charge Jesus with having feigned by means of certain sorcery that he was the one who was proclaimed by the prophets as [coming] to reside, and was called Christ in accordance with the ancestral [forms of speech] of the Jews." Cf. further V, 51: Celsus says that we "have let ourselves be carried away by sorcery by Moses or by our Saviour Jesus himself." VIII, 9; VIII, 39: Celsus calls Jesus a demon.

³ PIONIUS, *Acta Sanctorum*, 1 February (Paris 1863, Febr. Band I, p. 45): "Dicunt [Judaei] praeterea, Christum necromantiam exercuisse eiusque vi post crucem fuisse suscitatum" (see STRACK, *op. cit.*, p. 9).

other: "but only in the capacity of a man whom they took to be a magician with miraculous signs and a rival in teaching," on the grounds of which they punished Him for departing from and destroying Judaism.¹ In various writings we also encounter the name Panthera. ORIGEN tells how Celsus, in the role of the Jew, describes the mother of Jesus "as repudiated by the carpenter who was betrothed to her, found guilty of fornication and pregnant by a certain warrior, called Panthera." ORIGEN goes on to say that they "blindly concocted all this, to do away with the unprecedented conception by the Holy Ghost."²

During the early Middle Ages a Jewish work was compiled which, in the course of the centuries, has undergone every possible change in its arrangement and growth: the *Tol'doth Yeshu* or *Ma'aseh Talui*, in which the life of Jesus is described. The book has had an eventful history, and in former times circulated in Hebrew and in Yiddish, particularly among the simple Jews, whilst the more educated Jews also used to read it "during the nights of Natal (Christmas)."³ In what STRACK calls the "oldest evidence of a Life of Jesus written

¹ TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.*, III, 6: "Et adeo non qua alterius dei Christum aversati persecutique sunt, sed qua solummodo hominem, quem planum in signis et aemulum in doctrinis existimabant, ut et ipsum hominem qua suum, id est Iudaeum, sed Iudaismi exorbitatorem et destructorem, deduxerint in iudicium et suo iure punierint, alienum scilicet non indicaturi" . . . Cf. TERTULLIAN, *De Spectaculis*, cap. XXX, in which Tertullian describes the accusation of the Jews that Jesus was a "destroyer of the Sabbath, a Samaritan and someone who had the devil" (*Hic est ille, dicam, fabri aut quaestuariæ filius, Sabbati destructor, Samarites et daemonium habens*). See STRACK, *op. cit.*, p. 14 . . . Cf. ARNOBIUS, *Adv. Gentes*, I, 43: "My opponent will perhaps meet me with many other slanderous and childish charges which are commonly urged. Jesus was a magician; he effected all these things by secret arts. From the shrines of the Egyptians he stole the names of angels of might, and the religious system of a remote country" (transl. Archibald Hamilton Bryce and Hugh Campbell).

² ORIGEN, *c. Celsum*, I, 32. Cf. also I, 33 and I, 69 . . . Some later authors failed to note the insulting meaning of the name *Pañthera*, see STRACK, *op. cit.*, p. 10 ff.

³ However often the work that appeared under the name *Tol'doth Yeshu* (family of Jesus), *Ma'aseh Talui* (acts of the hanged one), *Ma'aseh Yeshu* and other titles was changed, the gist of its contents remained the same. Cf. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 47 ff.; MOREAU, *Les plus anciens témoignages profanes sur Jésus*, p. 85; JOCZ, *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ*, pp. 60-64. GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 158, says that the *Tol'doth Yeshu* is a combination of Biblical data, apocryphal writings, doctrines of sects, Talmud, folklore, associations of ideas "and a sprinkling of confusion." According to KLAUSNER the work has no historical value, but it does have value in that we can learn from it "what was the view of the Jews on the life and teaching of Jesus, from the fifth to the tenth centuries" (p. 53). As such it nevertheless has "historical" value in a certain sense.

by the Jews (Tol' doth Yeshu)," reported by Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons (d. 840), it is said that Jesus was accused on account of a multitude of lies and, because of a serious crime, was "hanged from a stake as a vile magician."¹

To what extent there is any connection between the work mentioned by Agobard and the oldest Tol'doth Yeshu is immaterial here; however, one thing that is certain is that the nature of Jesus' "sorceries" is described in detail in the Tol'doth Yeshu. In the following summary we shall confine ourselves to what the Tol'doth Yeshu tells of Jesus' miracles.²

In the temple was the Foundation Stone, on which the letters of the Ineffable Name of God stood.

Yeshu came and learned the letters of the name; he wrote them upon the parchment which he placed in an open cut on his thigh and then drew the flesh over the parchment.

The insurgents with him asked that if Yeshu was the Messiah he should give them a convincing sign. They, therefore, brought to him a lame man, who had never walked. Yeshu spoke over the man the letters of the Ineffable Name and the man was lame no more. Yet another sign did he give them. They brought a leper; he spoke the letters of the Ineffable Name, and the leper was healed. Thereupon, they worshipped him as the Messiah, Son of the Highest. The Sanhedrin was desirous of Yeshu's apprehension.

The Sages bound him and led him before Queen Helene, with the accusation: This man is sorcerer and entices everyone. He has not fulfilled the signs and conditions of the Messiah. Yeshu spoke up: Madam, I am the Messiah and I revive the dead. A dead body was brought in; he pronounced the letters of the Ineffable Name and the corpse came to life. The Queen was greatly moved and said: This is a true sign. She reprimanded the Sages and sent them humiliated from her presence. . . Yeshu went to Upper Galilee. . . The

¹ STRACK, *op. cit.*, p. 14 f. . . . Agobard, *De Judaicis Superstitionibus*, in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, Vol. 104. "Ad extremum vero propter plura mendacia accusatum Tiberii iudicio in carcerem reclusum eo quod filiae ipsius (cui sine viro masculi partum promiserat) lapidis conceptum intulerit. Inde etiam veluti magum detestabilem furca suspensum." STRACK refers further to the *Epistola contra Iudaeos* of Amolo, Archbishop of Lyons from 841 to 852. Cf. LINDESKOG, *op. cit.*, p. 196 ff., "Die jüdische Toledot-Jeschu-Forschung." Samuel Krauss thinks that as early as the 5th century an "Ur-Toledot" came into being (p. 197).

² We shall as far as possible literally follow the translation by GOLDSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 147 ff., who himself follows the Wagenseil edition.

Sages came before the Queen, complaining that Yeshu practised sorcery and was leading everyone astray. Therefore she sent Annani and Ahaziah to fetch him.

He spoke the Ineffable Name over birds of clay and they flew into the air. He spoke the same letters over a millstone that had been placed upon the waters. He sat in and it floated like a boat. When they saw this the people marvelled. At the behest of Yeshu, the emissaries departed and reported these wonders to the Queen. She trembled with astonishment. Then the Sages selected a man named Judah Iskarioto and brought him to the Sanctuary where he learned the letters of the Ineffable Name as Yeshu had done. When Yeshu was summoned before the Queen, this time there were present also the Sages and Judah Iskarioto. Yeshu said: It is spoken of me, I will ascend into heaven. He lifted his arms like the wings of an eagle and he flew between heaven and earth, to the amazement of everyone. The elders asked Iskarioto to do likewise. He did, and flew towards Heaven. Iskarioto attempted to force Yeshu down to earth but neither one of the two could prevail against the other, for both had the use of the Ineffable Name. However, Iskarioto defiled Yeshu, so that they both lost their power and fell down to the earth, and in their condition of defilement the letters of the Ineffable Name escaped from them. Because of this deed of Judah they weep on the eve of the birth of Yeshu. Yeshu was seized. His head was covered with a garment and he was smitten with pomegranate staves, but he could do nothing, for he no longer had the Ineffable Name.

He was imprisoned in the synagogue of Tiberias, and a crown of thorns was placed upon his head. However, together with his followers Yeshu succeeded in escaping to Antioch (or Egypt). Yeshu then resolved to go to the Temple to acquire again the secret of the name. On the eve of the Passover he entered Jerusalem on an ass, accompanied by 310 followers. There he was seized.

Yeshu was put to death on the sixth hour on the eve of the Passover and of the Sabbath. When they tried to hang him on a tree it broke, for when he had possessed the power he had pronounced by the Ineffable Name that no tree should hold him. He had failed to pronounce the prohibition over the carob-stalk, for it was a plant more than a tree, and on it he was hanged. They buried him outside the city.

Simeon, having gained the secret of the Ineffable Name, healed

a leper and a lame man by means of it and thus found acceptance and a true disciple. He said that Yeshu was with his Father in heaven. . .

If this hotchpotch is analysed and, as far as possible, verified against the very different sources from which its data have been derived, it will nevertheless be seen that a certain thread has been adhered to tenaciously throughout the whole, viz. the accusation that Jesus was a seducer of the people and a magician. It is that thread which starts with the pronouncement in Mt. 9 : 34—see above—and which is continued most consistently.

We have already made a passing reference to the climate which manifests itself in the Tol'doth Yeshu. KLAUSNER says that it can be seen in that work how greatly the tension between Jew and Christian was aggravated and that the Jews, incapable of avenging themselves on their persecutors and enemies by deeds, did so in speech and in writing. "The inventions and legends, compact of hatred and sometimes of penetrating and stinging ridicule against Christianity and its Founder, went on increasing. — The Jews of the Middle Ages did not deny that Jesus worked miracles but (and this shows their state of mind at the time) agreed that he really did so, but it was by use of the "Ineffable Name," by magic and with evil purpose!"¹ The Jewish attitude towards the Tol'doth Yeshu is thus a very reserved one. But the conclusion at which GOLDSTEIN arrives regarding the passages on Jesus in the Talmud shows that, even now, Jewish scholars try to defend the Talmud tooth and nail and to "exonerate" it from the blame cast on it from the Christian side.²

For obvious reasons it is not possible closely to follow Jewish literature, which developed vigorously in the course of the centuries, and to check what Jewish scholars, in the development of their critical meditations on the Founder of Christianity and the Christian

¹ KLAUSNER, op. cit., p. 53. . . Cf. LINDESKOG, op. cit., pp. 16 f. and 196 ff., "Die jüdische Toledot-Jeschu-Forschung." COUPER, *The Jew and Jesus*, p. 10 f.

² GOLDSTEIN, op. cit., p. 232. "We compared the Talmudic evidence with the accounts of the Gospels and the Church Fathers and we realised that in the Tannaitic period none of the bitterness is shown by Jews towards Jesus which is recorded in the Christian literature. Best remembered were: the power to heal in his name; a Pharasaic-like exposition of Scripture attributed to him; the fact that he left disciples; an unhistoric tradition of the circumstances of his trial and death. Since he was regarded as a Jew there was still within Judaism, at the beginning of the third century, association with the followers of Jesus . . . Nothing is recorded of Jesus' preaching and rules of conduct because, presumably, these in the main were in accord with the accepted teachings of the time."

faith, thought of the miraculous power and the miracles of Jesus. In many works the main stress is laid on the fact that Jesus may not be regarded as the promised Messiah. Why this is so is explained in all kinds of ways, and with recourse to the Old Testament. Belief in the divine nature of Jesus is challenged, and the fundamental dogmas of Christianity are regarded as completely unfounded and unacceptable.¹

We shall therefore confine ourselves to a number of important Jewish works of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. It will be appreciated that the development of scientific thought influenced Jewish opinions on the person and works of Jesus. The modern Jewish scholar can hardly accuse Jesus in all seriousness of "sorcery!" If he does not cast doubt on the historicity of Jesus, he will have to try to "explain" the miracles of Jesus in another way. And who can blame him for then making assiduous use of the fruits of rationally slanted and liberal exegesis?

In KLAUSNER's lengthy book a survey is given of modern Jewish literature on Jesus. Klausner begins by singing the praises of Joseph Salvador's "excellent" work. Salvador was not able to use Strauss' important book but, although he did not concern himself much with criticism of the Old Testament and the New Testament, he often arrived "intuitively" at the same ideas as Strauss (!).² SALVADOR

¹ See BROYDÉ, art.: "Polemics and Polemical Literature (The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. X, pp. 102-109). The article surveys Jewish literature published in various countries on Jesus and Christianity. Here and there it brings out the fierce nature of Jewish polemics. However, the survey is very brief, with all due deference to the remark by KLAUSNER, op. cit., p. 106, note 27, that Broydé here presents an "important article." LINDESKOG, op. cit., p. 26, summarizes: "die ältere jüdische Auffassung von Jesus" as follows: "1. Jesus ist ein Mensch, keine göttliche Gestalt (Gott kann 'im Leibe einer Jüdin' nicht geboren werden, wie es drastisch heisst). 2. Jesus hat die messianischen Weissagungen vom Weltglück und Weltfrieden nicht erfüllt und kann also nicht als der Messias betrachtet werden." This view is also held by modern Jewish thinkers.

² KLAUSNER, op. cit., pp. 106-124. . . . Klausner criticizes Schweitzer because in his "Leben-Jesu-Forschung" the latter says Salvator instead of Salvador. "It would seem that Schweitzer had either never seen or never read the book, either because it was written in French—or because it was written by a Jew . . ." (p. 107). LINDESKOG, op. cit., p. 96: "Der eigentliche Begründer der modernen jüdischen Leben-Jesu-Forschung ist der französische Arzt und Geschichtsphilosoph Josef Salvador (1779-1873)." . . . "Charakteristisch für das Werk ist die Bestrebung, das Leben Jesu konsequent nach *profangeschichtlichen* Gesichtspunkten und Methoden zu erfassen und zu erklären" (p. 98). See also Jocz, The Jewish People and Jesus Christ. Jocz says: "It is now possible to speak of a distinctly Jewish Leben-Jesu-Forschung. The Jewish effort is directed to reclaiming Jesus the Jew from the Gentile Church and to reinstating him to a

is of the opinion that Jesus performed miracles not because the Jews demanded them, but to "reveal" Himself. Jesus made use thereby of current ideas.¹ In Graetz's work, which KLAUSNER discusses with reverence, we can clearly see the traces of rationalistic thought. Through His mental influence Jesus healed neurotics and hysterical women, and aroused spiritually dead souls to new life.²

The way in which KLAUSNER speaks of the miracles of Jesus and divides them into five categories is highly reminiscent of Von Harnack's classification in five groups. Klausner's subdivision is as follows:

- (1) "Miracles due to a wish to fulfil some statement in the Old Testament or to imitate some prophet" (examples: raising the dead, miraculous feedings).³
- (2) "Poetical descriptions which, in the minds of the disciples, were transformed into miracles" (example: the cursing of the fig tree).
- (3) "Illusions" (example: Jesus' walking on the water).
- (4) "Acts only apparently miraculous" (example: the stilling of the storm).
- (5) "The curing of numerous 'nerve-cases'."

place of honour in Jewish history . . . Every effort is made to keep separate the prophet of Nazareth from the Second Person of the Trinity" (p. 7; cf. p. 130 f.).

¹ SALVADOR, *Jésus Christ et sa Doctrine*, II, p. 97¹): "En fait, ce n'est point du tout sur la demande des Juifs que le fils de Marie commence ses œuvres miraculeuses et qu'il en poursuit le cours. Jésus, dans les Évangiles, opère ses miracles pour se manifester lui-même, pour attester sa nature céleste; il obéit à la situation générale qui, dans tout l'univers connu à cette époque, chez les Égyptiens, dans l'Asie et chez les Grecs, autant que chez les Juifs, se compliquait du goût plus ou moins exagéré du merveilleux."

² See KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 109 ff. . . . Klausner praises the work of: "H. Graetz, *Sinai et Golgotha, ou les origines du judaïsme et du christianisme* suivi d'un examen critique des Évangiles anciens et modernes. Traduit et mis en ordre par Maurice Hess, Paris 1867." As regards Graetz' interpretation of Jesus' miracles, Klausner states that Jesus healed the mentally ill by His exalted ethics. "But Graetz would not deny that Jesus did, literally, engage in healing: he healed such as were afflicted with nervous illnesses and hysterical women, and such as, in those days, were supposed to be possessed by an evil spirit; and this he did through his spiritual influence. The proof of this is to be found in the fact that his disciples also practised the driving out of evil spirits and uttering incantations over a snakebite. This spiritual healing was the only thing in Jesus that was new; in all other respects Jesus was 'a teacher honoured in his own circle just as Hillel was in his circle . . .'" (p. 111).

³ A remark such as: "Jesus, who was, in the opinion of his disciples, the greatest of the prophets or even greater than a prophet (as was John the Baptist, according to Jesus), must do wonders like them and also surpass them", (*op. cit.*, p. 268) immediately recalls Strauss.

KLAUSNER guards against a negativistic attitude.¹ He believes that without a doubt Jesus had particularly great suggestive powers. In another form Mohammed and Napoleon had them too. Many neurotics were definitely healed completely by His strong, personal, hypnotic influence.² All this demonstrates that KLAUSNER shares the traditional views of the rationalists and thus is prepared to accept as possible what is or could be medically and psychologically possible.

Finally, we may mention EISLER's "discovery." This Jewish scholar endeavoured to prove in a gigantic work that Jesus, "the King who never reigned," was pursuing political aims. According to EISLER Jesus was a carpenter, a carpenter's apprentice. This very ordinary occupation need by no means preclude His descent from the Royal House of David, says EISLER, recalling what Ottokar Lorenz liked to say in his talks on genealogy about there being more royal children running about in the world than appear in family trees. Now EISLER draws attention to a fact which, he says, "has never been noticed, to the best of my knowledge," viz. that these artisans, these carpenters "at the same time tell fortunes and practise medicine as part of their job." As an example he mentions the Schleb, wandering artisans still to be found today, who not only are good carpenters, but also treat human beings and animals on their travels.³

¹ KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 267: "Since modern science cannot imagine an effect without an external or internal cause, it is unable to rest content with the simple answers offered in the age of the Encyclopaedists—that all the miracles attributed to Jesus, as well as to other great men in the world, are mere inventions deliberately contrived by 'cunning priests'."

² "This force which Jesus had, comprises some secret, some mystical element, still not properly studied by the ordinary psychologists and physicians and scientists, who are conversant only with the laws of nature so far determined by science" (*op. cit.*, p. 270). Cf. BONSIRVEN, *Les Juifs et Jésus*, p. 95. The miracles are: "ou bien niés, ou bien expliqués naturellement."

³ EISLER, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 174-193, "Der Zimmermannssohn als Messias ben David." Jesus was "the carpenter's son," Mt. 13 : 55, a "bar naggara" or "ben charash", a woodworker. Eisler recalls Zech. 1 : 18-21, which mentions four "carpenters." Now old Arabic manuscripts and the Koran speak of David as the "armourer." However, the word "charash" also has the meaning of "to do magic." Well then, the "horns of the Gentiles" (Zech. 1 : 21) were defeated by the "four magicians". These "magicians" are types of the Messianic redeemers, so that, according to Eisler, there is an obvious line: descent from David — carpenter — magician. "Wenn ein solcher 'haraš' oder naggara mit dem allgemeinen Ansehen dieser Leute als Wunderärzte und Beschwörer noch den Ruf verband, ein Nachkomme des gottgesalbten Königs David und des weisen, allen zauberskundigen Königs Salomo zu sein, sodass er mit allem Wissen des 'Kurschmieds' noch das Heilcharisma der grössten Könige verband, denen nicht nur die Menschen, sondern

Jesus was thus a wandering "carpenter"/miracle-worker, driven by political aspirations, who believed that, as a descendant of David, He had been chosen by God to found a new kingdom.¹ His miracles were subservient to His political mission, which, according to EISLER, is clearly demonstrated by the miraculous feeding as a sign of the coming liberation.²

The result of our investigation may be summarized in a few words. The Talmud stigmatizes Jesus as a "seducer of the people" and a "magician." To the modern Jewish scholar, who sets out to read the Gospels as objectively as possible, Jesus was a personality who could heal or improve the sick by suggestion,³ whilst in EISLER's

auch die Tiere und die Dämonen gehorchen, so kann man sich leicht vorstellen, welcher Zulauf von Heilsuchenden ihn umdrängen musste" (p. 190 f.).

¹ "Jesus tut Wunder, weil er überzeugt ist, der von Gott erwählte, dadurch zum 'Sohn Gottes' und zum davidischen 'Menschensohn' gewordene ben David, der 'Schmied' des Heils, der tektoon der zu erneuernden Welt zu sein, und jedes Wunder, das er tut, bestätigt ihm aufs neue seine Erwählung von Gottes Gnaden" (II, p. 193).

² Jesus had: "eine Volksmenge in die Wüste hinausgeführt und ihr dort das Mannawunder und die Vorzeichen der kommenden Befreiung gewiesen und gedeutet." He wanted to do what Theudas (Ac. 5 : 36) tried to do: "zu der von Gott bestimmten Zeit hoffte er das Volk aus der Wüste wieder über den Jordan in das von den Feinden durch die Drangsale der Endzeit und den messianischen Krieg befreite Land der Verheissung zurückzuführen" (II, p. 249 f.).

³ KLAUSNER, op. cit., p. 10. He wants to obtain a clear idea, not of the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, or vice versa, "but simply how Judaism differs and remains distinct from Christianity or Christianity from Judaism. This alone is the object of the present book; and every effort has been made to keep it within the limits of pure scholarship and to make it as objective as possible, avoiding those subjective religious and nationalist aims which do not come within the purview of scholarship." Cf. From Jesus to Paul, p. 600 ff. LINDESKOG, op. cit., p. 325: "Den Höhepunkt der jüdischen Evangelienkritik und Jesusforschung bezeichnen heute Montefiore und Klausner." The two of them are thoroughly at home in both Jewish and Christian science. See his opinion of Klausner, p. 110 ff. Klausner, the "Nationaljude," is: "ein typischer Vertreter der freisinnigen jüdischen Einstellung" (p. 111); "die ewig jüdische Antwort" to the question of the person of Jesus: "Jesus ist der jüdische Mensch, der in dem christlichen Kultus Christus und Gott wurde" (p. 112). . . . In the concise sketch by CLAUDE G. MONTEFIORE, What a Jew Thinks about Jesus, practically no other points of view come to the fore. Jews and Christians are prejudiced towards one another; they both make a selection from the writings of the Bible and base on it their religion, etc. Montefiore says: "Jesus is for me *one* of the greatest and most original of our Jewish prophets and teachers, but I should hesitate to say that he was *more* original than any one of them" (p. 516). In the Gospel of Mark a number of stories are "so mixed up with strange miracles as to be doubtfully historic." At the end of the study the essential point comes to the fore: "Yet, perhaps, there is still something more, which may rightly be set down as Jewish stubbornness or perversity. The Jew cannot find God in man. He habitually thinks of God as

opinion the carpenter/miracle-worker Jesus ben David believed Himself called by God as a "smith of salvation" to found a new kingdom.

a being infinitely greater, holier, more glorious, than the most admirable man who ever lived . . . If I could believe that Jesus was God, then he *would* obviously be my Master. For *my* Master—the Master of the modern Jew—is, and can only be, God" (p. 520).

PART THREE

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

JESUS AS MIRACLE-WORKER

I. JESUS' MIRACULOUS POWER

In each of the four Gospels we are confronted from the very outset with the miracles and signs which Jesus performed in the midst of His people. His activities were "forceful." It is impossible to detach Jesus' words and deeds from one another; they are inseparably interwoven.¹ Understandably, this way of acting has released a flood of questions of every kind. In an attempt to answer these questions one may not make a random selection from the Gospels and then formulate a few conclusions; the data should be carefully investigated.

We shall try to follow this method by means of the following plan:

- (a) Data on the miraculous power and the miracles in the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John.
- (b) Jesus' opinion of His miraculous power.
- (c) Extent of the miraculous power.
- (d) The period during which miracles were performed.
- (e) The nature of the miracles.
- (f) Jesus' "knowledge."

¹ Many have pointed to the inherency of word and miracle. RICHARDSON, *The Miracle-stories of the Gospels*, p. 1. The miracle stories are "an essential and inseparable part of the Gospel tradition," cf. p. 135. FILLION, *Les Miracles de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, p. 1. The miracles form: "une partie essentielle de son rôle et de sa vie." FRIDRICHSEN, *Le Problème du Miracle*, p. 9: "Les miracles ou actes de puissance surnaturelle de Jésus tiennent une très grande place dans les écrits évangéliques et forment un des traits essentiels de la figure la plus ancienne du Christ." MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 334. Jesus was sent to teach and to heal. "The latter is as much an essential of his mission as the former." KLIJN, *Inleiding tot het N.T.*, p. 28. We are concerned "with a Lord in whom word and deed cannot simply be separated. Jesus' word of power was just as much a sign of his Messiahship as his deed of power." LEWIS, *Miracles*, p. 161: "The mind which asks for a non-miraculous Christianity is a mind in process of relapsing from Christianity into mere 'religion'." BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 234: "Wer das Besondere, was Jesus nach den Evangelien *getan* hat, durch Verweisung in den Bereich des Mythos problematisieren will, sollte sich fragen, ob er nicht zuerst und vor allem das, was Jesus nach denselben Evangelien *gesagt* hat, dorthin verweisen müsste, weil es an normaler Begreiflichkeit wahrhaftig nicht weniger — vielleicht eher noch mehr! — zu wünschen übrig lässt." See also I, 1, p. 420 f.

- (g) The problem of the belief in demons.
- (h) Healing and the Sabbath.
- (i) The miraculous power of the disciples.

(a) *Data on the miraculous power and the miracles in the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John*

The first thing that strikes us when we investigate the miracle stories is that John went his own way in selecting his miracle stories. But the Synoptists, too, do not all have the same stories of miracles, whilst the miracles narrated are not placed in the same frame by everybody. The versions differ quite considerably from one another in some cases. Why? What was the intention of each of the three Synoptists in editing his version in the way he did and in placing it in the setting chosen by him? It is, of course, possible here and there to make surmises and to suggest solutions, but the whole is concealed by the veil under which the synoptic problem as such lies.¹

However, one point on which the Evangelists are unanimous is that Jesus acted with "power".

¹ According to KLIJN, op. cit., the same kind of material was used in the Synoptic Gospels and the same traditions concerning Jesus were drawn on, but these have been incorporated quite differently (p. 46). This material incorporated in the Gospels must have had a function in the old Church (p. 23) . . . Similar considerations would therefore also have to apply to the miracle stories, and in connection with our subject we wish to point to two studies by HELD and BORNKAMM, also mentioned by Klijn. In his *Matthäus als Interpret der Wundergeschichten* (BORNKAMM et al., *Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev.*, pp. 155-299), HELD tries to show that the "retelling" (die Neuerzählung) of the miracle stories by Matthew was done in accordance with a theological plan, for the instruction of the Church. When Matthew shortens the miracle stories, this is not a loveless or formal treatment of the subject-matter, but deliberate exegetic work. And the omission of two miracles reported by Mark—Mk. 7 : 31-37; 8 : 22-26—must also be regarded from the point of view that for Matthew the miracle stories are "bearers" of a proclamation, a doctrine or an admonition (p. 286; cf. p. 195 ff.). The above two miracles, according to HELD, offer no scope for "erbauliche Interpretation." See also the concise study by BORNKAMM, *Die Sturmstillung im Matthäus.-Ev.*, also in *Überlief. u. Ausleg.*, pp. 48-53. . . . Now HEADLAM, in his "The Miracles of the New Testament" published in 1914, remarks that when Matthew omits a number of miracles, this does not mean to say "that S. Matthew thought the stories unedifying" (this is aimed at J. M. Thompson, *Miracles in the New Testament*, who is of the opinion that Matthew considered himself entitled "to omit some incidents from the account of our Lord's life which seemed to be unedifying"), but he omits them because he did not consider it necessary to include every story which came his way (p. 210 f.). Our question is: what exactly is edifying or unedifying interpretation? See further the instructive works by CONZELMANN, *Die Mitte der Zeit*, p. 177 ff. and by MARXSEN, *Einführung in das Neue Testament*.

Various terms are used to designate the power of Jesus and the deeds arising out of it.

(a) Jesus has "power," "authority." The word used for this means that God gave Jesus full and sovereign authority to teach and to act, whilst remaining in communion with and obedient to the Father.¹ As a result of this power, Jesus is able to do "mighty works," the expression often used by the Synoptists to designate Jesus' miracles.²

¹ ἐξουσία; potestas; מְשָׁלָה and derivations of שָׁלַט. Jesus taught them ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, Mt. 7 : 29; Mk. 1 : 22; ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ, Lk. 4 : 32. God had given ἐξουσία unto men, Mt. 9 : 8. The disciples were given ἐξουσία, Mt. 10 : 1; Mk. 3 : 15; 6 : 7; Lk. 9 : 1. Jesus was asked about His ἐξουσία, Mt. 21 : 23, 24, 27; Mk. 11 : 28, 29, 33; Lk. 20 : 2, 8. Jesus was given πᾶσα ἐξουσία Mt. 28 : 18 . . . The Son of man has ἐξουσία to forgive sins, Mt. 9 : 6; Mk. 2 : 10; Lk. 5 : 24 . . . The disciples have ἐξουσία to tread on serpents and scorpions, Lk. 10 : 19 . . . God has ἐξουσία to cast into hell, Lk. 12 : 5 . . . The Son of man has ἐξουσία to execute judgment, Jn. 5 : 27 . . . Jesus has ἐξουσία to lay down life and ἐξουσία to take it up again, Jn. 10 : 18, from which the combination of bestowed power and freedom to act is evident . . . God has given the Son ἐξουσία over all flesh, Jn. 17 : 2. CHAJES, Markus-Studien, pp. 10-12, is of the opinion that in the Hebrew version Mk. 1 : 22 may have originally been: "he taught them as preacher of parables and not as the scribes." A careless copyist may have changed במשל into כמשל. משל can mean both "recite parables" and "rule," and the two concepts were confused on more than one occasion. Chajes believes that his theory is supported by Mt. 7 : 28, 29, and thinks that Jesus' method of teaching, often in parables, contrasted favourably with the "dry method" of the scribes and was more to the liking of the people. For the concept ἐξουσία see FOERSTER, TWNT, II, p. 557 ff. ἐξουσία is to Jesus: "die ihm von Gott gegebene Vollmacht und Macht zum Handeln." GRUNDMANN, Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt, p. 55 ff., believes that the word ἐξουσία is characteristic of Matthew, see Mt. 28 : 18. The kerygma of Matthew is: Christ, who has "all power," is: "Bringer und Verkünder des Himmelreiches" (p. 57). BARTH, K.D., III, 1, p. 37 f. Jesus has the ἐξουσία of the word, of the doctrine, of revelation, of the forgiveness of sins, of healing. The Gospels point again and again: "auf diesen Machtbesitz und diese Machtübung Jesu" (p. 38).

² δυνάμεις; virtus; חֵיל; גְּבוּרָה; כֹּחַ, etc. . . . The invocation of the δυνάμεις πολλάς which have been done, Mt. 7 : 22 . . . The δυνάμεις in Chorazin and Bethsaida, Mt. 11 : 20, 21; Lk. 10 : 13 . . . The question, whence Jesus has these mighty works and their absence, Mt. 13 : 54, 58; Mk. 6 : 2, 5 . . . Herod ascribes the δυνάμεις of Jesus to John the Baptist risen from the dead, Mt. 14 : 2; Mk. 6 : 14 . . . The Sadducees do not know τὴν δυνάμιν τοῦ θεοῦ, Mt. 22 : 29; Mk. 12 : 24 . . . Jesus notices that δυνάμεις has gone out of Him, Mk. 5 : 30; Lk. 8 : 46 . . . Jesus returns ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος to Galilee, Lk. 4 : 14 . . . Jesus commands the unclean spirits ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει, Lk. 4 : 36 . . . Jesus is acclaimed περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμειων, Lk. 19 : 37 . . . The men of Emmaus call Jesus δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ, Lk. 24 : 19 . . . Peter calls Jesus ἄνδρα ἀποδεδειγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμει καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις, Ac. 2 : 22 . . . Cf. also Ac. 1 : 8; 4 : 33; 6 : 8; 1 Co. 5 : 4; 12 : 28; 2 Co. 12 : 12 (the σημεία, τέρατα, δυνάμεις of Paul); Gal. 3 : 5 (the δυνάμεις that Christ works); Eph. 3 : 16; 2 Th. 2 : 9 . . . For the concept δυνάμεις, see GRUND-

(b) Jesus is the "strong one;" He is "mighty." He is stronger than John the Baptist and stronger than Satan, although the latter is called the "strong man."¹ GRUNDMANN attaches great importance to the pronouncement of Jesus in Lk. 11 : 20-22, in which He speaks of the victory of the stronger over the strong. As the "strong one" Satan rules over men and enslaves them by the forces of sin and possession, disease and death, using the demons as his servants in this work. However, Christ, as the "stronger," penetrates the house of the strong one—for the expulsion of the demons must be so seen—and gains the victory.²

(c) In Jesus is revealed the "strength" of God, which no other force can resist.³

(d) The miraculous deeds of Jesus are called "signs." We often encounter the combination "signs and wonders."⁴

MANN, TWNT, II, p. 286 ff.; GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 55 ff. Referring to Lk. 1 : 35, Grundmann says: "Für Lukas ist δύναμις in besonders sichtbarem Masse behaftet mit der Vorstellung einer Kraftsubstanz." "Von seiner Geburt her ist Jesus mit Kraft begabt und ist Kraftträger" (p. 61). See also CONZELMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 168 ff.

¹ ισχύς; fortis; כֹּחַ, מְעוּ, עוֹ, גְּבוּרָה, etc. Jesus is ισχυρότερος than John the Baptist; Mt. 3 : 11; Mk. 1 : 7; Lk. 3 : 16 . . . Jesus' pronouncement on the binding of the ισχυρός, Mt. 12 : 29; Mk. 3 : 27; Lk. 11 : 21, 22. The disciples οὐκ ἔσχυσαν to heal a possessed boy, Mk. 9 : 18.

² GRUNDMANN, TWNT, III, p. 400 ff. Grundmann sees in this pronouncement by Jesus a very old tradition preceding Gemeindetheologie. "Damit ist aber ein für das Verständnis der synoptischen Geschichte einfach entscheidender Gesichtspunkt gewonnen: wir stossen in diesem Jesuslogion, das sich einem näheren Zusehen als ursprünglich erweist, auf das entscheidende Selbstverständnis Jesu, auf die Urchristologie, die ganz schlicht in der Tatsache begründet liegt, dass Jesus der ισχυρότερος ist, der den ισχυρός besiegt hat und seine Beute raubt. Von dieser urchristologischen Aussage aus entfaltet sich das synoptische Jesusbild ganz konsequent" (p. 404 f.). Grundmann sees a "closed connection" between Isa. 53 : 12, Lk. 11 : 22 and Mt. 20 : 28: "in dem Leben und Sterben und damit auch Auferstehen des Christus zusammengefasst sind als die entscheidende Befreiungstat des Christus für die Menschen; diese Tat wirkt sich in seinem Dienst an ihnen aus" (p. 405).

³ κράτος; potentia; עוֹ, כֹּחַ, תִּיל, etc. Ἐποίησεν κράτος ἐν βραχίονι αὐτοῦ. Lk. 1 : 51. This is the only place in the Synoptic Gospels where κράτος occurs. Cf. Eph. 1 : 19; Eph. 6 : 10 (ἐνδυναμοῦσθε ἐν κυρίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κρᾶτει τῆς ισχύος αὐτοῦ. The three concepts for force: δύναμις, κράτος and ισχύς are used here); Col. 1 : 11; the use of κράτος in the doxologies: 1 Tim. 6 : 16; 1 Pe. 4 : 11; 5 : 11; Jude, verse 25; Rev. 1 : 6; 5 : 13. According to MICHAELIS, TWNT, III, p. 905, κράτος is more closely related to ισχύς than to δύναμις. It is in the first place natural strength, physical strength, and then power, force, dominion.

⁴ Sign: σημεῖον; signum; אֹת. Miracle: τέρας; prodigium; מוֹפֶת, פֶּלֶא.

The above summary shows that the miraculous power of Jesus plays an extremely important part in both the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of John. In view of the difference in the words and the concepts, many scholars are of the opinion that there is a difference between the way the Synoptists see this power and the way John sees it. For in the latter's Gospel the three Synoptic terms expressing "power" are not to be found. However, a closer investigation reveals that the depiction of this concept is not entirely absent from John. He speaks of the "power" of Jesus, Jn. 10 : 18, whilst Jn. 16 : 33 implies a supreme power.¹ Whilst the fourth Evangelist repeatedly calls the miracles of Jesus "signs," this term in the direct sense is

וּפְלְאוֹת. In the Synoptic Gospels *σημεῖον* is used separately when Jesus is asked for a sign: the Jewish leaders want to see a sign; Mt. 12 : 38 ff.; Lk. 11 : 29 ff.; Mt. 16 : 1 ff.; Mk. 8 : 11 ff.; Jesus is asked for a sign to tempt him, Lk. 11 : 16; Herod hopes to see some miracle done, Lk. 23 : 8. . . . In the Gospel of John the miracles of Jesus are repeatedly called *σημεῖα*, Jn. 2 : 11; 2 : 23; 3 : 2; 4 : 54; 6 : 2; 6 : 26, 30; 7 : 31; 9 : 16; 11 : 47; 12 : 18, 37. . . . See further: Ac. 4 : 16; 8 : 6; 8 : 13 (*σημεῖα καὶ δυνάμεις*). . . . The combination "signs and wonders" occurs in Mt. 24 : 24; Mk. 13 : 22 (*σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα* of false Christs); Jn. 4 : 48 (pronouncement by Jesus). Further in Ac. 2 : 43; 4 : 30; 5 : 12; 6 : 8; 7 : 36; 14 : 3; 15 : 12; Ro. 15 : 19. The combination *σημεῖα, τέρατα, δυνάμεις* is used in Ac. 2 : 22; 2 Co. 12 : 12; 2 Th. 2 : 9; He. 2 : 4. . . . In the eschatological sense, Lk. 21 : 11, 25; Ac. 2 : 19. . . . Signs of Satan, Rev. 13 : 13 f.; 16 : 14; 19 : 20. . . . Further, Mt. 21 : 15 speaks of "wonderful things", *θαυμάσια*; *mirabilia*, **וּפְלְאוֹת**. Cf. also "marvellous" in Mt. 21 : 42; Mk. 12 : 11; Jn. 9 : 30;

Rev. 15 : 1, 3: *θαυμαστός*; *mirabile*; **וּפְלְאוֹת**. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 954, points to the following midrash which speaks of the difference between wonders and signs: "Leqach tob zu Ex 3, 12 (9b): Das Zeichen **וּפְלְאוֹת** geht auf die folgende Zeit, s. Ex 8, 19; Jes 38, 22; 7, 11, 14. Jedes *Zeichen* geht auf die folgende Zeit u. gilt nur dem, zu dem man es sagt, u. keinem andren Menschen. Das *Wunder* **וּפְלְאוֹת** aber tritt sofort ein, s. Ex 7, 9: Wenn der Pharao so zu euch sagen wird: 'Verrichtet für mich ein Wunder,' so sollst du zu Ahron sagen: Nimm deinen Stab u. wirf ihn vor den Pharao hin; er soll zu einer grossen Schlange werden. Das sollte sofort eintreten. . . . Ähnlich das. zu Ex 7, 9 (17b)." BARTH, K.D., II, 1, p. 683, after having pointed to various deeds by Jesus, makes the following distinction: "Darum heissen seine Taten nach ihrem erstaunlichen Verhältnis zu dem, was sonst geschieht: *τέρατα*, nach ihrem Sinn und Zweck für die, an denen und vor denen sie geschehen: *σημεῖα*; nach ihrem eigenen inneren Wesen aber selber: *δυνάμεις*, Kraftwirkungen."

¹ GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 80 ff., sees the presence of the idea of power in Jn. 16 : 33. "Hier ist der Kosmos als die feindliche Macht verstanden, die der Christus überwunden und besiegt hat. Wir finden also im Johannesevangelium dieselben Grundanschauungen wieder wie im übrigen neutestamentlichen Kerygma." The power of Christ means to John "richterliche Vollmacht" (p. 82). See Jn. 3 : 2. Cf. GRUNDMANN, TWNT, II, p. 304. The word *δύναμις*, cf. Jn. 3 : 2; 9 : 16; 11 : 37, indicates that the power of the Father is working in the Son.

absent from the Synoptists.¹ Now do these differences warrant the assumption that the opinions of the Synoptists and of John differ greatly? Or that the narration of miracles in John plays a special part, viz. to bring the whole of this Gospel into divine relief?

TRAUB is of the opinion that in the Gospel of John in particular the miracles are "inflated," since Jesus had to be defended in missionary preaching against the Jews, whilst according to JELKE, SAINTYVES, TITIUS, and others miracles in John have to stress the divinity of Jesus.² PERELS points to the difference in the relation between Jesus' teaching and His miracles in the Synoptic Gospels as compared with the fourth one. He draws attention to the fact that in the Gospel of John it is not the message in the miracle that finds expression, but the powers of Christ that come to the fore. A further point that we notice is that in John miracles do not serve the word, but the accompanying word elucidates the real meaning

¹ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 24: "Es ist von Wichtigkeit darauf zu achten, dass das Wort σημειον innerhalb der synoptischen Überlieferung nie von den getanen Wundern Jesu gebraucht wird." Cf. RENGSTORF, *TWNT*, VII, p. 233.

² TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.*, p. 47. . . . Traub points to Jesus' invocation of His miracles, Jn. 10 : 38. Here the miracles are embedded in a given dogmatic train of thought. JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 25. SAINTYVES, *Le Discernement du Miracle*, p. 48. The Gospel of John is: "le poème du Verbe incarné"; everywhere there is exaltation. . . . TITIUS, *Natur u. Gott*, p. 125: "Der vierte Evangelist stellt die Wunderwerke Jesu in Parallele mit den spezifisch-messianischen Werken der Totenauferstehung und des Weltgerichts a) und schmiedet eine Kette sich steigernder Machttaten bis zur Entfaltung der vollen Herrlichkeit des Gottessohnes." a) Jn. 5 : 20-29 . . . MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 337. In the Synoptic Gospels the miracles are "rather the proof of his humanity than of his divinity." In John it is "the sign, the evidential demonstration of his divinity, that is emphasised." Cf. MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 26. . . . FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 16, calls the Gospel of John an artistically dramatized history of Christ. One's attitude towards the healings, which are condensed in it to "virtues of God" (ἀρεταὶ θεοῦ), must be very reserved. BULTMANN, *Die Theologie des N.T.*, in the chapter "Die Theologie des Johannes-Evangeliums," deals with miracles in John. As σημειῖα Jesus' miracles, like His words, are "zweideutig." They are: "freilich auffallende Vorgänge . . . ; sie weisen darauf hin, dass die Offenbarung kein weltliches, sondern ein überweltliches Geschehen ist. Sie sind Bilder, Symbole" (p. 391). Jesus' "works" are verba visibilia. "In der Tat: die Werke Jesu—als Ganzes einheitlich gesehen: sein Werk—sind seine Worte." The actual works of Jesus are "judging" (κρίνειν) and "making alive" (ζωοποιεῖν), which happens through the word (p. 406 f.) . . . The miracle stories, which the fourth Evangelist probably derived from a written source: "zeigen schon stilistisch ein über die synoptische Tradition hinaus entwickeltes Stadium" (p. 350), CLAVIER, *Les sens multiples dans le Nouveau Testament*, speaks of: "le jeu des sens multiples," especially in the Gospel of John.

of the miracle.¹ Hence the impossibility of the intrinsic separation of word from miracle in the fourth Gospel.² GOPPELT, who regards the Gospel of John from the typological point of view, believes that in this Gospel the typology recedes somewhat; although Christ is compared with the Old Testament mediators of salvation, He does not appear as their "anti-type," but as their "Lord." He is the "personal" salvation of God, God's "gift of salvation." The miracles indicate that Jesus is the Renewer, the Transformer of life.³

We have reproduced above a number of views in which reference is made to a number of discrepancies between the Synoptists and John regarding miracles. It is inevitable that the great difference which happens to exist between the Synoptists and John also comes to light in the miracle stories.⁴ Most of the miracles related by John differ from those of the Synoptists, whilst he displays remarkable exactitude in his details.⁵

However, when we compare the whole of the Synoptic miracle

¹ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 18. . . . In the Synoptists, too, we already find traces of reflection, i.e. that the miracle serves to designate a doctrine, e.g. Mt. 14 : 28-31; 21 : 18-22; 17 : 24-27; Lk. 5 : 1-11. These miracles are closer to the Johannine than to the other Synoptic miracle stories. "Sie sind der Anfang der Entwicklung, die zur johanneischen Wunderdarstellung führt" (p. 17).

² PERELS, *op. cit.*, p. 88: "Das Wunder ist dort tatgewordenenes Wort, das Wort zum Teil Auslegung des Wunders" . . . According to STAUFFER, *Die Theologie des N.T.*, p. 149 (cf. p. 102), the Synoptic Jesus performs: "Rettungswunder, die den Glauben voraussetzen. Der johanneische Christus aber vollbringt Offenbarungswunder, die seine Herrlichkeit enthüllen und auf diesem Wege den Glauben wecken. Aber so verschieden auch die beiden Wunderbegriffe sind, sie begegnen sich da, wo die Evangelien in ihren Wunderberichten den Weg vom Glauben zum Glauben herausarbeiten."

³ GOPPELT, *Typos*, p. 221 ff. In the prologue it is already stated that: "In Jesus die Heilsgaben der Mosezeit in vollendeter Gestalt erschienen seien" (p. 222).

⁴ We cannot deal with the Johannine problem here. A good survey is given by KOOLE, *De opvatting van Johannes*, in Waszink et al., *Het oudste Christendom en de antieke Cultuur*, Part II, pp. 209-231. See also: G. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v. h. N. T.*, p. 204 ff.; p. 323 ff. BARRETT, *St. John*, Introduction. TAYLOR, *The Person of Christ*, pp. 99-123, VIII, *The Fourth Gospel*. "The doctrinal interest" of John is also evident from "the heightened miraculous element" in the miracle stories (p. 101). As regards the eschatological problem, see VAN HARTINGSVELD, *Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums*. WILKENS, *Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums*.

⁵ See BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 117. . . . In the Gospel of John no mention is made of the healing of the possessed, which led HERDER, *Von Gottes Sohn, der Welt Heiland*, to make the following pronouncement: "Von dämonischen Kranken schweiget Johannes; er will nicht, dass dieser palästinische Aberglaube ein wesentlicher Zug des Christenthums, ein Vorwurf der spottenden oder ein Glaube der thörichten Welt werde" (p. 267).

stories and those of John with each other, we note that the similarities are greater than the dissimilarities. We have already mentioned GRUNDMANN's remark about the depiction of Jesus' power in the Gospel of John.¹ The argument adduced from several sides that in the Synoptists the stress lies more strongly on the mercy of Jesus, whilst for John the manifestation of Jesus' glory is the prime factor, does not hold good as a general statement.² KOOLE rightly says, pointing to this difference, that it is not correct to see a contrast between Jesus' power and His mercy.³ Jesus' mercy is His power of love, directed towards man in need, which we encounter in each of the four Gospels. Despite the differences regarding content, rendering and accentuation, we may say that the Synoptists and John, who in essence have the same proclamation of the gospel, do not move in different spheres as regards miracles, either.

(b) *Jesus' opinion of His miraculous power*

In the Gospels we find relatively few places where Jesus Himself says something about His miracles. Where He did so, this was the result of a question or an incident, but nowhere do we find an expatiation, a clear explanation of miracles.⁴

Jesus answered John the Baptist's question whether He was the one "that should come" by pointing to His miraculous healings in a pronouncement reminiscent of the prophecies of Isaiah, Mt. 11 : 4, Lk. 7 : 22. A strange feature is that in Mt. 11 : 4 "hear" precedes "see," whilst in Lk. 7 : 22 just the opposite is true. However, both texts first refer to the miraculous deeds, followed by the statement that the poor have the gospel preached to them! In His upbraiding of Chorazin and Bethsaida, Mt. 11 : 20-24 and parallel passage, Jesus recalls the many "mighty works" which were done by Him

¹ GRUNDMANN, TWNT, II, p. 304: "Dem Jesusbild der Synopse fügt sich das Jesusbild des Johannesevangeliums durchaus ein."

² G. SEVENSTER, op. cit., p. 326, note 1. . . . RICHARDSON, *The Miracle-stories of the Gospels*, p. 27 ff., combats this point of view. Both in the Synoptists and in John the miracles are "evidence (not to the general public, but only to those who have eyes to see) as to Who Jesus is. This, we shall maintain, is their *raison d'être* in all four Gospels."

³ KOOLE, op. cit., p. 214.

⁴ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 20: "Bedeutsam ist die geringe Zahl der Worte Jesu, die seine Wunder erwähnen. Jesus spricht nur da von seinen Wundern, wo der Anlass dazu durch die Worte oder das Verhalten Anderer an ihn herangetragen wird. Diese Tatsachen zeigen, dass keine Reflexion über die Bedeutung des Wunders vorliegt."

in those cities and which ought to have made the people repent.¹ The same holds good for Capernaum. In the address in the synagogue at Nazareth, Lk. 4 : 16 ff., Jesus relates the reference which He reads, Isaiah 61 : 1,2, to Himself. He has been anointed by the Spirit of the Lord to perform such mighty works. Jesus reminds the disciples of the miraculous feeding, Mt. 16 : 8 ff. and parallel passage. When a number of Pharisees come to inform Jesus that Herod wishes to have Him killed, Jesus has the message conveyed to His ensnarer that He casts out devils and does cures, Lk. 13 : 31 ff. The background of Jesus' miracles is, however, most clearly seen in the passages about Jesus and Beelzebub. Jesus says that He casts out devils by the Spirit (finger) of God, which points to the coming of the Kingdom of God, Mt. 12 : 28 and parallel passage. He has come to smash Satan's power in all fields.² Although the data in the Synoptic Gospels are relatively sparse and brief, they are clear proof that Jesus gave a very important place to His miracles.

In the Gospel of John we perceive a certain reflection. Jesus repeatedly speaks of His "works," which bear witness to His mission and to the salvation which He brings, Jn. 5 : 36, 10 : 25, 15 : 24. The Father "hath given all things into his hand," Jn. 3 : 35, in fact, "given him power over all flesh," Jn. 17 : 2. The works of God are the works of the Son, whose will it is to finish God's work, Jn. 4 : 34. The Jewish view of the Sabbath cannot hamper this work, Jn. 5 : 17; for that reason, too, Jesus asks why people are angry with Him for having "made a man every whit whole" on the Sabbath, Jn. 7 : 23. The Son "quickeneth whom he will," Jn. 5 : 21, and He works "while it is day," Jn. 9 : 4. Jesus stresses His "many good works" which He has shown the Jews from His Father, Jn. 10 : 32, and He exhorts the Jews to believe in His works, Jn. 10 : 37, 38.³

¹ JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 26: "Diese Strafrede wäre undenkbar, wenn in diesen Städten nicht wirklich viele grosse und allgemein anerkannte Wundertaten Jesu geschehen wären." . . . KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, deduces from these harsh words "that his condition was becoming worse; he saw no progress in his work: he is indignant and curses" (p. 295).

² PERELS, *op. cit.*, p. 19: "In der Antwort auf die Anklage des Teufelbündnisses haben wir die ausführlichste Äusserung Jesu über sein Wundertun—speziell sein Dämonenaustreiben." MANSON, *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 168: "Against the might of the Kingdom of God all the forces of evil are powerless. This consciousness of being the vehicle of an irresistible power runs through all the teaching of Jesus . . ."

³ Cf. Jn. 14 : 11. See BERTRAM, *TWNT*, II, p. 639, on the works performed by Jesus Christ as "deeds of salvation of God." The believers are also called to do

Particular attention should be paid to Jn. 1 : 51, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending on the Son of man." This statement contains a reference to the story of Jacob's dream, Gen. 28 : 10-17. Jesus said this when Nathanael had come to believe on the strength of Jesus' special knowledge. But the disciples are to see greater things.¹ BORNHÄUSER is of the opinion that in these words, as in Mt. 26 : 53, Jesus attributed to Himself an "unlimited miraculous power."²

Although it is stated differently in the Gospel of John, the same trend is perceptible in this Gospel as in the Synoptic Gospels. Jesus has power and He knows, and bears witness, that He has received this power from the Father and may use it as He wishes. Just as from His preaching, His "being," if the term may be permitted, can be learnt from His works.³ Some have gone still further in their investigation. BULTMANN has tried to arrive at a solution to the problem of the relation between Jesus' belief in miracles and His thoughts on God, a solution which we do not consider successful.⁴ The danger of overstepping the mark is imminent here. It seems to us to be an equally precarious venture to designate a certain "source" for Jesus' miraculous power. Attention is then drawn to Jesus' personality, His character, His faith, His prayer. FRIDRICHSEN says that Jesus' miracles were the product of His "mighty eschatological faith,"⁵ whilst CAIRNS sees the roots of Jesus' power in "His unique

these works. "Die έργα τοῦ Θεοῦ, die durch Christus, und die, die durch die Gläubigen geschehen, sind nicht begrifflich voneinander zu trennen. Es handelt sich um das eine Gotteswerk." RENGSTORF, TWNT, VII, p. 246 ff.

¹ Cf. BULTMANN, Das Evangelium des Johannes, p. 74: "Ein solches Wunder also genügte schon, den Glauben zu wecken; aber der Glaube, einmal wach geworden, wird noch weit grössere Wunder schauen!" According to Bultmann, verse 51 is an addition by the Evangelist.

² BORNHÄUSER, Das Wirken des Christus, p. 38 f.

³ PERELS, op. cit., p. 19: "Jesus weist auf seine Wundertätigkeit und sein Predigen als das hin, woraus man sein Wesen erkennen kann."

⁴ BULTMANN, Jesus, p. 164: "Versteht man Jesu Wunderglauben als die allgemeine Überzeugung, dass gewisse Vorgänge, die wir heute auf natürliche Ursachen zurückzuführen pflegen, auf einer höheren göttlichen Kausalität beruhen, so ist er sinnlos und hat kein Verhältnis zu seinem Gottesgedanken. Versteht man ihn aber als den Ausdruck des Glaubens, dass Gottes Wille nicht im allgemeinen sichtbar ist, sondern sich in einzelnen besonderen Geschehnissen zeigt, so gehört er notwendig mit seinen Gottesgedanken zusammen. Er enthält dann die gleiche Paradoxie, die für den Gottesgedanken Jesu überhaupt charakteristisch ist: das Nebeneinander des fernen und des nahen Gottes."

⁵ FRIDRICHSEN, Le Problème du Miracle, p. 47: "Ses dunameis sont les effets

spiritual character," which found its strength in prayer.¹ We have to be careful with such statements, since (a) Jesus nowhere explicitly ascribes His miraculous power to His faith, His prayer or His character; (b) because the data from the Gospels regarding the faith and prayer of Jesus are open to various views.² We in no way mean that there is no intimate relation between miracles, faith and prayer, but that the data are incorrectly interpreted when it is said of a certain mental or spiritual quality—personality, character, faith, prayer—there, *that* is the source!³ When we think of Jesus' words about His casting out the demons by the Spirit of God, Mt. 12 : 28, and the many statements about His "works" in communion with the Father, we believe that we come closest to the truth when we say that Jesus, as the Son of God, "knew" that He was acting under the direction of and in obedience to the Father by doing those works in which the power of Satan was checked, and the forces of nature were subjected to His will so that it could be revealed that the Kingdom of God had come. Consequently, it must not be said that Jesus "believed" in His miracles,⁴ as a man can "believe" in miracles. For Jesus the performance of the miraculous act, whenever He considered it necessary, was a demonstration of the self-evidence of the accomplishment of God's will and the unquestionableness of that will being done. Jesus was "Lord" in, through, and of His miracles.⁵

de sa puissante foi eschatologique laquelle était ancrée, à son tour, dans sa foi inébranlable en Dieu qui le remplissait en entier et le rendait heureux." . . . TITUS, *Natur u. Gott*, p. 778: "Dass Jesu gewaltiger einzigartiger Glaubensmut ihn zu wunderbaren Heilkuren befähigen konnte, wird kein Heilkundiger bestreiten wollen. Die Grenzen bestimmen zu wollen, in denen sich dies Charisma zu betätigen vermochte, wäre Vermessenheit." VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *Parapsychologie en Godsdienstig leven*, p. 63. The healer must "believe" in the effect emanating from him. "The faith of Jesus himself was the assurance of one who had been called."

¹ CAIRNS, *The Faith that Rebels*, p. 84: "The roots of His unique power over nature lie therefore in His unique spiritual character, not in His metaphysical Divinity, but in His perfect humanity. All this seems irresistibly implied in His sayings about prayer." . . . "The Gospel theory of the 'miracles' of Jesus is that they are the answers of God to the prayers of the Ideal Son, the Man who is the supreme instance, in history, of Faith, Hope and Love . . ." And this "ideal Man" invited His disciples to perform "similar enterprises of faith" . . . PETERSEN, *Naturforschung u. Glaube*, p. 40: "Wenn Jesus Kranke heilt, so verrichtet er nicht Mirakel, bei denen er etwa Kräfte anwendete, die ausserhalb des Weltlaufs liegen, sondern Wunder, die in seiner Person begründet sind."

² See G. SEVENSTER, *op. cit.*, p. 27 ff.

³ See the chapter: Relations involved in the Miracles of Jesus.

⁴ FILLION, *op. cit.*, p. 65. Fillion refers to Mt. 9 : 2-7; Lk. 5 : 18-26.

⁵ TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.*, p. 47: "Das gehört zur unvergänglichen

(c) *Extent of the miraculous power*

Many wonder how far Jesus' miraculous power extended. Was this power unlimited? Was it or was it not dependent on circumstances, on the mental attitude of others? Are there anywhere traces of a diminution of the miraculous power?

Apart from the odd exception, the Synoptic Gospels describe Jesus as someone who was able without restriction to perform miracles of various kinds. For the fourth Evangelist there is no possible doubt on this score: "the Father. . . hath given all things into his hand," Jn. 3 : 35, 13 : 3. The exception which the Synoptists mention deserves close attention. When Jesus is in His own country and teaches in the synagogue there, those present are astonished at His "wisdom" and His "mighty works," but at the same time they speak among themselves of His family and take offence at Him. Jesus then says: "A prophet is not without honour, save in his own country, and in his own house."¹ In the continuation of the text we encounter a number of nuances. Mt. 13 : 58 reads: "And He did not many mighty works there because of their unbelief." In Mk. 6 : 5, 6 we find: "And he could there do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk, and healed them. And he marvelled because of their unbelief." In Lk. 4 : 24-27 Jesus follows His words by examples from Israel's past. The text in Mark clearly seems to point to inability on the part of Jesus: He "could there do no . . .!" Did Matthew therefore alter and tone down this text, which as it stood could give offence?² Needless to say, these words have become the peg on which efforts have been made to hang opinions about a limited extent of Jesus' miraculous power, even of His failures.³ But is this what the text is trying to imply? "By virtue

Grösse Jesu, dass er *über* seinen 'Wundern' stand und nicht in ihnen aufging." An excellent comment is that of J. JEREMIAS, *Jesus als Weltvollender*, p. 21: "Die Neuschöpfung der Welt hat in meinen Wirken begonnen—das ist der Sinn der Antrittspredigt in Nazareth und der Antwort Jesu an den Täufer."

¹ Mt. 13 : 57; cf. Mk. 6 : 4; Lk. 4 : 24; Jn. 4 : 44. . . . See KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, for parallels from profane literature. Other prophets share Jesus' fate.

² KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium* . . . See BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 361 f., for the fortunes and variants of the text. Numerous Italcodices have replaced "and he could there do no" by "and he would there do no" or "and he there did no" . . . Origen, *Comm. in Mt.*, t. X, 19, discussing the difference between Mt. and Mk., says that no doubt may be cast on the omnipotence of Jesus, but that what is said here is that for miracles collaboration between divine force and faith is necessary (BAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 362).

³ KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 282, says about this text: "This last fact is

of His communion with God, Jesus' power as Saviour knows no bounds, but the use of it does," as GOPPELT rightly remarks.¹ That is to say, the miraculous power is as such not "dependent" on the trust of others, as SCHMIEDEL thinks.² Jesus' miraculous power is there, and it is always there, but it is not a magic stream permanently carrying miracles, but a force which materializes in salutary fashion only when there is receptivity, faith, or when Jesus deems its revelation necessary.³

one the importance of which it is impossible to exaggerate: from it we recognize the nature of his miracles and the attitude towards him of those who had known him from childhood and during his ordinary life. They did not perceive the transformation that had been effected in him, and he could not give them signs and proofs testifying to the fundamental change in his spiritual powers. He left Nazareth in despair never to return." Cf. p. 272: "... his miracles were not always successful and he was afraid to attempt them too often; he even disliked publicity for the successful miracles lest the people insist on more." SCHÄFER, *Jesus in psychiatrischer Beleuchtung*, p. 65: "Ebenso ist es noch heute so, dass die Wunderärzte im Dorf nichts gelten, Patienten nur von auswärts haben, da Nichterfolge in der nächsten Bekanntschaft dauernd der Prüfung, Besprechung unterliegen. So hat Jesus sicherlich auch Nichterfolge gehabt, gerade an seinem Geburtsort, wie aus den Evangelien hervorgeht."

¹ GOPPELT, *Typos*, p. 86: "Jesus selbst stellt die Gewährung und Versagung seiner Heilsgaben unter die Ordnung Gottes, die sich in der Beauftragung der Propheten bekundet." With His Old Testament examples in Lk. 4 : 25 and 27 Jesus wants to teach the people: "dass Gottes Gnade nach freiem Ermessen denen zuteil wird, die sie gläubig aufnehmen" (p. 86). RIDDERBOS, *De komst van het Koninkrijk*, correctly comments that "the point is not whether Jesus had the power to do miracles but whether He was permitted to exercise that power under all circumstances. Where faith is absent there is no place for miracles . . . The 'he could there do no mighty work' of Mk. 6 : 5 must therefore be understood as an impossibility within the framework of Jesus' mission and activities" (p. 114). According to LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle*, p. 353, Jesus could always work miracles, if he wanted to, "sans que cependant ce pouvoir fût en Lui un habitus permanent." Cf. p. 469 ff. In Jesus' soul the power to do miracles was not present as a permanent form or quality, but as a motion: "un mouvement imprimé par manière d'influence. En un mot, cette vertu n'est pas un prédicament, mais un des postprédicaments, appelé motus, prédicament qui s'applique à l'action et à la passion tout ensemble." FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, re Mk. 6 : 5: "Das soll im Sinn des Mk. nicht bedeuten, dass Jesu Wunderkraft erlahmte und versagte, denn er betrachtet Jesus als mit übernatürlicher Macht ausgestaltet. Aber die wirklichen historischen Vorgänge schimmern hier deutlich durch. Jesu Wunder waren nicht etwas automatisch Funktionierendes, sondern durch den ihnen entgegenkommenden Glauben bedingt" (p. 94).

² SCHMIEDEL, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 47: "Also steht geschichtlich fest, dass Jesu Heilungstätigkeit psychologisch von dem Vertrauen derer, die Heilung suchten, abhängig war."

³ Cf. DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*: "Gott kann nicht wirken, wenn ihm alle Herzen verschlossen sind, er braucht offene Türen." GOULD, *St. Mark*: "Jesus required faith for the performance of his miracles, and that was wanting here; nay, there

(d) *The period during which miracles were performed*

The Gospels do not say that Jesus performed miracles even before His baptism. But soon afterwards reference is made to healings alongside the preaching.¹ The question now arises whether there is any relation between Jesus' baptism and His miraculous power. Now the baptism of Jesus is a problem in itself. We are of the opinion that this baptism was not a dedication or an adoption but that: "Jesus is by the baptism proclaimed and designated by God as One in special relation to Him, namely as His Son, who is the Messiah and possesses the Holy Spirit as the essential element of His person and work," to borrow DE BEUS' excellent description of Jesus' baptism.²

was a positive misbelief, no mere doubt." See further VAN LEEUWEN, Markus; KEULERS, Marcus en Lucas; HAUCK, Markus, says: "Nicht von fehlender Gelegenheit, aber von mangelnder Kräftigkeit redet der Bericht höchst altertümlich undogmatisch . . .," but Hauck sees the cause in lack of faith. GRUNDMANN, TWNT, II, p. 303: "Die Wunder haben zur Voraussetzung den Glauben des Täters und dessen, der das Wunder empfängt. Sie werden also in einer durchaus personalen Beziehung vollzogen. Jesus kann in Nazareth kein Wunder tun, weil der Glaube fehlt (Mt. 13, 58 par)." BORNHÄUSER, Das Wirken des Christus, p. 38 f., points for a designation of Jesus' unlimited miraculous power to Jn. 1 : 51 (cf. Gen. 28 : 12) and Mt. 26 : 53. "Damit hat Jesus sich unbegrenzte Wundermacht zugeschrieben." . . . BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 239 f., rightly says that it is evident from the majority of the miracle stories that Jesus does not operate "planmässig." Barth goes on: "Es geht jeweilen einfach nicht anders, als dass er sie tut. Er tut sie oft schlicht durch seine Gegenwart inmitten des ihn umdrängenden Volkes, wobei er dann—gewissermassen sein eigener Zuschauer—'an sich selbst bemerkte, dass eine Kraft von ihm ausging' (Mr. 5, 30 f.). "Die ihn anrührten, wurden gerettet," heisst es Mr. 6, 56 ganz allgemein. Jesus 'macht' keine Wunder. Er *tut* sie, indem sie durch ihn *geschehen*. Wunder, die nicht in dieser Absichtslosigkeit geschehen, sind Wunder jener *anderen* Art." This is really a most dangerous formulation! Barth rightly comments that Jesus is not a physician, magician or pastor in the technical sense of the word. But as Barth sees it, the impression is created that Jesus Himself was somewhat outside His works. However, the accounts clearly show that Jesus performed His works consciously and with a meaning. That is why He also refused to do those "signs" for which the Jewish leaders asked Him (Mt. 12 : 38; 16 : 1; Mk. 8 : 11; Lk. 11 : 16). BETZ, Jesu heiliger Krieg, p. 132 f., recalls the wonderful signs of "Messiahs" and "prophets" (Theudas, the Egyptian, and others) mentioned by Flavius Josephus.

¹ SCHLEIERMACHER, Das Leben Jesu, p. 204, believes that "Wundertun" must have occupied a considerable portion of Jesus' life. Perhaps miracles happened very early on: "die Mutter Christi wird dargestellt als schon an die Wunder glaubend, und das lässt schliessen dass Christus vorher auch schon Wunder getan hat" (p. 209).

² DE BEUS, De oud-christelijke Doop en zijn voorschiedenis, p. 132 f. GILS, Jésus Prophète, points to Lk. 4 : 1, 14 and 18, in which Lk. recalls "le don de l'Esprit" in baptism. "Dans ce triple rappel du don de l'Esprit, l'évangéliste a

Jesus did not therefore first become aware that He was the Messiah when He was baptized; the baptism is the proclamation that Jesus is the Messiah-King who is now going to begin His work.¹ This view implies that it must not be thought that He received the miraculous power during baptism, as a special charism, but that Jesus, from the beginning of His activities, also revealed the power of the Kingdom of God in His wonders and signs. JEREMIAS even speaks of the "cosmic" significance of Jesus' baptism; the barren time is past and a new creation has dawned.²

There is no trace to be found anywhere of a diminution of Jesus' miraculous power.³ Even the cry at the cross: "He saved others; himself he cannot save," Mt. 27 : 42 and parallel passages, is clear proof of how fresh the healings of Jesus were in the minds of the bystanders.

FILLION tried to arrange Jesus' miracles in chronological order. He makes a distinction between six periods of miracles, viz. a preparatory period, from the baptism to the calling of the disciples (four miracles); the first period of His ministry (sixteen miracles); the second period (eight miracles); the third period (six miracles); the last days of Jesus' life (four miracles); after the resurrection (one miracle). A total of thirty-nine miracles, in other words.⁴

manifestement en vue une explication théologique de l'œuvre de Jésus; celle-ci est le fruit de l'onction de l'Esprit reçue au Baptême" (p. 70 f.). Cf. Lk. 5 : 17 and 10 : 21.

¹ VAN DER LOOS, Jezus Messias-Koning, p. 77 ff.

² J. JEREMIAS, Jesus als Weltvollender, p. 17. Jesus' baptism is not only: "Berufsausrüstung", "sondern er hat kosmische Bedeutung." "In mir, das ist Jesu Hoheitsaussage, dem Träger und Bringer des Gottesgeistes, hat die Neuschöpfung, die Weltvollendung, begonnen." CAIRNS, The Faith that Rebels, p. 92, calls Jesus' baptism "the ultimate explanation of all the 'signs' of Jesus."

³ See Mt. 21 : 14, 15, the healings in the temple; Jn. 21 : 25. . . Cf. FILLION, Les Miracles de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ, p. 27. . . According to C. H. Weisse, Die Evangelische Geschichte kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet, 1838, Jesus undertook His last journey to Jerusalem on the strength of an irrational, higher necessity. Perhaps it may be surmised that Jesus' miraculous power was on the wane, from which He derived that God's hour had come, for He did no further signs in Jerusalem . . . See for this SCHWEITZER, Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung, p. 136.

⁴ FILLION, op. cit., p. 25 ff. . . Miracles during the preparatory period: sign at Cana (Jn.); first cleansing of the temple (Jn.); healing of the nobleman's son (Jn.); Jesus withdraws to Nazareth (Lk.). During the first period: first catch of fish (Lk.); the demoniac at Capernaum (Mk., Lk.); Peter's mother-in-law (Mt., Mk., Lk.); the leper (Mt., Mk., Lk.); the paralytic at Capernaum (Mt., Mk., Lk.); the paralytic at Bethesda (Jn.); the withered hand (Mt., Mk., Lk.); the centurion's servant (Mt., Lk.); the young man at Nain (Lk.); the deaf and dumb

However praiseworthy any attempt to establish a relation between things may be, as regards the Gospels any attempt at exact chronological arrangement is doomed to failure, since the Gospels are after all not a progressive biography, but testimony combined in a historical framework.

(e) *The nature of the miracles*

Our investigation is not concerned with the miracle in which Jesus forms the centre of attention, the miracle of Jesus Himself—His birth, transfiguration on the mountain, resurrection, ascension. It relates to the miracles wrought by Jesus, to His deeds.

Although at bottom all miracles involve in some way or the other an effect on the ordinary, known order of nature, a distinction can be made, having regard to the subject, between nature miracles and healing miracles. The healing miracles of Jesus can in turn be subdivided into the healing of the possessed and the healing of ordinary diseases. It is possible to make more subtle distinctions, but this general subdivision sufficiently reproduces their character.¹ The place and the significance of Jesus' miracles will be discussed elsew-

demoniac (Mt., Lk.); the stilling of the storm (Mt., Mk., Lk.); the Gadarene demoniac (Mt., Mk., Lk.); the woman with an issue (Mt., Mk., Lk.); Jairus' daughter (Mt., Mk., Lk.); the healing of two blind men (Mt.); the healing of the deaf and dumb man (Mt.). During the second period: the first miraculous feeding (Mt., Mk., Lk., Jn.); walking on the Sea (Mt., Mk., Jn.); the daughter of the woman of Canaan (Mt., Mk.); healing of the deaf and dumb man (Mk.); the second miraculous feeding (Mt., Mk.); healing of the blind man (Mk.); the "lunatick" boy (Mt., Mk., Lk.); the coin in the mouth of the fish (Mt.). During the third period: healing of the man born blind (Jn.); the woman bowed together (Lk.); the man with dropsy (Lk.); ten lepers (Lk.); resurrection of Lazarus (Jn.); the blind men of Jericho (Mt., Mk., Lk.). During the last days: the cursing of the fig tree (Mt., Mk.); the second cleansing of the temple (Mt., Mk., Lk.); the retreat of the soldiers during the arrest of Jesus (Jn.); Malchus' ear (Lk.). After the resurrection: the second catch of fish (Jn.). . . . We believe that Fillion's minute consideration of the miracles is worthy of mention, even though we do not agree with the result.

¹ Cf. the distinctions which Thomas Aquinas made; see the section in the first chapter on aspects of the struggle to define and explain miracles . . . Jesus did not perform any miracles on animals. LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle*, p. 498 ff., assumes that Jesus did not do so: "parce que ces animaux sont de la même nature sensible et corporelle que l'homme lui-même." According to Lépicier matters are different with fish. "Les animaux terrestres, en effet, furent créés le même jour que l'homme, mais les poissons le furent un autre jour." This solution seems rather artificial to us. . . . Aesculapius once healed the crippled claw of a cock. The healed bird proudly and elatedly demonstrated "the consideration of the god towards animals" (EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, p. 265 f.; see Aelidaus (*Fragmenta*, 98).

here, but, again paying attention to the subject, we should like to point out now that the aim of Jesus' miracles was in all cases the salvation of mankind. This means that Jesus did not perform a single punitive miracle. This cannot but strike us when we consider the numerous punitive miracles which are related in the Old Testament.¹ Whilst with the prophets of the Old Testament the saving, beneficial miracle has its place alongside punitive miracles, Jesus performed only beneficial miracles. When the disciples once proposed to Jesus that they "command fire to come down from heaven" on an inhospitable village of the Samaritans, Lk. 9 : 51-56, they were reprimanded by Him. GOPPELT believes that John the Baptist also expected punitive miracles from Jesus, having regard to his statement about the "fan" "in his hand" and about the separation between wheat and chaff, Mt. 3 : 12.² John's challenging question: "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?," Mt. 11 : 3 and parallel passage, is a pointer in this direction. John and Jesus held different views regarding the essence of the Messiah. Whereas for John the judicial function of the Messiah came first, for Jesus the Messiahship culminated in love and sacrifice, in tolerance and service.³ John expected a more vigorous, a stricter action by the Messiah, in which there might perhaps have been room for punitive miracles. The fact that the Baptist performed no miracles and signs acquires a deep background as a result of this. John still lived in the mental world of the Old Testament, in which there was room for force, even in miracles, but as Forerunner he also lived on the threshold of the New Kingdom in which, in miracles too, the power of force would yield to the power of love.⁴

¹ See Ex. 7-14; Lev. 10 : 1, 2; Nu. 11 : 1, 2; 12; 16; 21 : 4-9; Deu. 6 : 22; Jos. 7 : 16-26; 1 Sa. 16 : 14; 2 Sa. 6 : 6-7; 24 : 1-17; 1 Ki. 13 : 11-32; 17 : 1; 18; 2 Ki. 1 : 9-12; 2 : 23-25; 5 : 20-27; 6 : 13-23; 7 : 17; 8 : 1-3. Remember also the judgment preaching of the prophets.

² GOPPELT, *Typos*, p. 88. . . . Goppelt says the following about the significance of the Old Testament punitive miracles: "Die atl. Strafwunder bleiben für uns Hinweis auf das Richten Gottes unter der *ἀνοχή* und, wie für Christus, Typen des zukünftigen Gerichts, nicht aber der kirchlichen Gegenwart. Die Kirche steht unter dem Zeichen des Gekreuzigten und Auferstandenen, daher schon im neuen Äon, aber noch nicht unter dem Zeichen des wiederkehrenden Menschensohnes" (p. 88).

³ VAN DER LOOS, *op. cit.*, p. 72. STAUFFER, *Jerusalem u. Rom*, p. 93 f., sees the cause of the tension between Jesus and John in their different outlooks on the Torah. "Der Täufer war rigoristischer Thorajude. Jesus aber hat gerade in jenen Wochen ganz programmatisch mit der Thora gebrochen."

⁴ Cf. FRÖVIG, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, p. 260. The answer to John the

The punitive miracle also occurred frequently elsewhere. We find examples of it in the apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature of the Old Testament,¹ and in that of the New Testament, in which the performance of punitive miracles is imputed even to the boy Jesus.² Punitive miracles appear repeatedly in rabbinical literature.³ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS quotes a number of typical cases of punitive miracles.⁴ For Aesculapius the punitive miracle was a favourite means of exerting influence and collecting his fee.⁵

Baptist is for us: "eine Norm für die Beurteilung der Wundertaten, indem sie uns zeigt, dass die Wunder, sowohl seitens Gottes als seitens Jesu, prinzipiell gesehen, Barmherzigkeitsstaten gegen die gewesen sind, denen eine frohe Botschaft verkündigt wurde." THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa Theologiae*, III, qu. XXXVIII, art. II, thinks that John did not do miracles because, if he had done so, people would have "equally" followed Jesus and John. And therefore, so that people would mainly follow Christ, it was not given to John to do signs (*Si autem Joannes signa fecisset, homines ex aequo Joanni et Christo attendissent. Et ideo ut homines principaliter Christo intenderent, non est datum Joanni, ut faceret signum*).

¹ 2 Macc. 3. Heliodorus, who had gone to Jerusalem on the orders of the Syrian king Seleucus to demand the temple treasure, was sorely afflicted and struck blind in the treasury. Aristas' letter, 312-316, on God's punishment when someone committed the sin of translating or transcribing from Scripture. Offenders were afflicted with madness or blindness.

² THOMAS, *Paidika*. At a word from Jesus a young boy was paralysed (3 : 1-3). A second boy fell dead because he bumped into Jesus' shoulders (4 : 1). The people who complained to Joseph about this were struck blind (5 : 1). When Jesus was struck on the head by his Greek and Hebrew teacher, he cursed him and the teacher crashed unconscious to the ground. Sorrowfully Joseph said to his wife: "Do not let him go out, for those who arouse his wrath must die" (14).

ACTA PETRI (*Actus Vercellenses*) 2: At a word from Paul Rufina was afflicted with paralysis and dumbness.

³ FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 10. Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, 858 ff., and II, 26.

⁴ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, IX, X, 4. King Uzziah wanted to make an incense offering to God in the temple, clad in priestly robes. In vain the priests warned him. By way of punishment he was afflicted with leprosy. . . . When Herod was in need of money, he had David's grave opened, in which many treasures were concealed. However, when he even examined the coffins of David and Solomon, it is told that a flame shot out of them, which killed two of his servants; *Antiq.*, XVI, VII, 1.

⁵ HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros* . . . Herzog makes a distinction between the miracles which serve as a warning but end well, and those in which the deity awards an ultimate punishment (p. 123) . . . Such a warning is to be found for instance in miracle 3. An originally unbelieving man is healed, but by way of punishment he is to be known as *Apistos* (unbeliever) (p. 9 ff.). A healed blind man who did not pay his fee was made blind again by the deity. After his repentance he became healthy again (p. 17, miracle 22). Another healed blind man, who offered to the deity not a solid gold image but a piece of wood which had been immersed in Dutch gold, was blinded again. After he had sacrificed

We have deliberately lingered on punitive miracles. The account of the withered fig tree, Mk. 11 : 11 ff. and parallel passage, is more closely considered elsewhere. However, it is clear that this is not a "punitive miracle" in the ordinary sense of the words. It is in the very absence of punitive miracles that we see the entirely new aspect of Jesus' ministry. The Kingdom of God reveals itself as a Power of Love! ¹ And therefore John the Baptist performed no miracles and signs, whereas the disciples were given instructions and the power to do so by their Lord.

A further striking characteristic of the miracles of Jesus is that they never create the impression of show or sensation, as is several times the case with for instance Apollonius of Tyana. ²

A following characteristic is that Jesus never requested or accepted any payment for His benefactions, in contrast with Aesculapius (i.e. his priests), who charged a fee for each cure according to the patient's means. Jesus' disciples had also to give "freely" what they had received "freely," Mt. 10 : 8. The "reward" that Jesus asked for had to consist in honour and gratitude towards God, as shown by the Samaritan healed of leprosy, Lk. 17 : 15 ff. Jesus performed no other sort of miracles than those also attributed to pagan gods or miracle-workers. It is remarkable that we have no accounts of the healing of the possessed by Aesculapius. ³ Despite repeated urging,

real gold, his sight was restored (p. 31, miracle 55). Cf. also OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 207 ff. WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. 189: "Blendung ist eine ungemein häufige Strafe für irgendein Vergehen; vielfach gesellt sich nun zu diesem Strafwunder, als sein Gegenbild das Heilungswunder, das nach Versöhnung der erzürnten und beleidigten Gottheit eintritt." BETZ, *Lukian von Samosata und das N.T.*, p. 177 ff. on the "Topos des Strafwunders" in Lucianus.

¹ BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*. Jesus did not perform any judgment or punitive miracles. "Seine Wundermacht steht ganz im Dienste der helfenden Liebe" (p. 51).

² What are known as "Schauwunder." OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 207, also points to the "Luxuswunder" in the stories of Dionysus and then says: "Wo man von Luxuswundern reden könnte (Lk. 5, 1 ff.; vgl. mit J. 21, 1 ff.; Mt. 17, 24 ff.; J. 2, 1 ff.), scheint sekundäre Überlieferung vorzuliegen." The term "Luxuswunder" seems to us an unhappy choice for the Biblical miracle stories . . . Nor do we find anywhere in the Gospels a trace of the bizarre practices which Aesculapius occasionally adopted. He sometimes proposed to a sick person that he exchange his complaint for another one! For instance, a man who was suffering from epilepsy agreed after some hesitation to exchange his disease for ague. See EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, p. 238 f. In the case of another man (though here nothing is said about exchanging) the disease from which he was suffering changed into leprosy, which was then healed by Aesculapius by means of prescribed medicines (I, p. 250).

³ OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 207: "Dämonenaustreibungen fehlen in Epidauros,

Jesus never allowed Himself to be persuaded to perform additional signs or "Messianic" miracles. The miracles that He did reflected the glory of the coming Kingdom, and God's saving love was visible and present.

(f) *Jesus "knowledge"*

In the preceding pages we occasionally mentioned Jesus' special "knowledge." As this "knowing" plays such an important part, it is necessary to devote a separate section to it.

Several times the Gospels refer to the more than ordinary knowledge displayed by Jesus.¹ This "knowing" is, however, not confined to a particular natural talent, but transcends the normal and displays a divinatory nature. Jesus "sees" something "in his spirit."² He foretells His agony and death.³ Jesus foretells that His disciples will be offended; He prophesies His betrayal by Judas, His denial by Peter.⁴ He tells His disciples where they will find an ass.⁵ Reference is also made to the limits of His knowledge: "not the angels

wahrscheinlich deshalb, weil Geisteskranke in dem heiligen Bezirk nicht geduldet wurden" . . . Apollonius several times healed demoniacs (Vita III, 38 ff.; IV, 20).

¹ Lk. 2 : 40-52; Mt. 13 : 53-58 and parallel passages; Mt. 7 : 28, 29 and parallel passages.

² Mk. 2 : 8, ἐπιγινώσκω, cf. Mt. 9 : 4, οἶδα, Lk. 5 : 22, ἐπιγινώσκω. See further Mt. 12 : 25, οἶδα; Mk. 9 : 33; Mk. 12 : 43 f.; Lk. 6 : 8, οἶδα; Lk. 9 : 47, οἶδα . . . PETTAZZONI, in his extensive study "The All-Knowing God," has indicated the omniscience of a large number of gods. He makes a distinction between "magical and oracular knowledge," which "is ascribed to beasts, to exceptional men, and to sundry spirits," and "omniscience which we may call visual, inasmuch as it is based essentially on the power of sight, a knowing which comes from seeing, an εἰδέναι (to know) which is intimately connected with videre (to see)" (p. 4). This visual omniscience "is the specific attribute of deities" (p. 5). In Ch. V, pp. 97-114, PETTAZZONI, deals with Yahweh's omniscience. It is his opinion that Yahweh's knowledge "is, above all else, seeing; the verb y.d. means both 'know' and 'see', and often, when it has the former sense, it is associated or alternated with r.'h 'to see'" (p. 98).

³ Mt. 9 : 15 and parallel passage (in concealed fashion); Mt. 16 : 21 and parallel passages; Mt. 17 : 22 and parallel passages; Mt. 20 : 17-19 and parallel passages.

⁴ Mt. 26 : 31, 34; Mk. 14 : 27, 30; Lk. 22 : 34; Mt. 26 : 21; Mk. 14 : 18; Lk. 22 : 21.

⁵ Mt. 21 : 2, 3; (a colt in Mk. 11 : 2, 3; Lk. 19 : 30-32). Cf. Mt. 26 : 18 and Mk. 14 : 12-16: the preparation of the passover.

In connection with Mk. 14 : 12-16 and parallel passages BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 283 f., remarks as follows: "Jesu Vorauswissen erinnert an I Sam. 10, wo Samuel dem Saul voraussagt, wen er auf dem Wege treffen wird. Doch liegt schliesslich wohl das Märchenmotiv zugrunde, dass ein Wesen (meist ein Tier) dem Wandernden vorausgeht und ihm dadurch den Weg weist."

which are in heaven, neither the Son" know when the end of the world will come.¹

In the Gospel of John Jesus is shown as the Son of the Father who knows and can foretell everything.²

At quite an early stage the problem of Jesus' "omniscience" formed a point of lively discussion. In all kinds of ways efforts were made to demonstrate that Jesus was far superior to any child of man. In his *Paidika* Thomas praises the great gifts of Jesus, which cause His teacher Zacheus to cry: "I cannot follow his reasoning. I tried to have a pupil and it proved that I had a teacher."³

In the polemics in which the Christians had to engage both with Jewish opponents and with representatives of dissimilar trends, this problem put in an appearance again and again. ORIGEN tells us that the Jew Celsus is of the opinion that the disciples of Jesus did not have a single good fact on which to base their case, and therefore had made this up "to assert that he had known everything in advance."⁴ ORIGEN refutes him with the remark that references such as Mt. 26 : 31 and Mt. 26 : 34 in fact prove the writers' love of truth. Celsus concludes from Jesus' prediction of the betrayal by Judas and the denial by Peter that they ought to have feared Jesus in His capacity of God; in that case neither the betrayal nor the denial would have happened!⁵ Celsus' severe comment: "Jesus foretold all this, since he was a God, and what was foretold had to happen. A God therefore induced his own pupils and prophets, with whom he ate and drank together, to become godless and unholy," is countered by ORIGEN with the laboured objection that the prophet may not be confused with the cause of what is going to happen.⁶ EUSEBIUS points to Jesus' prediction of the downfall of the Jewish state, Mt. 24 : 19, which

¹ Mt. 24 : 36; Mk. 13 : 32. See for these texts VAN IERSEL, 'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten, pp. 117-123. As regards not knowing, see also the difficult text Mt. 16 : 28, and further Lk. 8 : 45; Lk. 8 : 30; Jn. 11 : 34 . . . See for the opposition of rabbis to the calculation of the beginning of the Messianic era STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 1013 ff. Details are to be found in SILVER, Messianic Speculation in Israel, Part II, Opposition to Messianic Calculation, p. 195 ff.

² Jn. 1 : 48; 2 : 25; 4 : 18, 19; 5 : 28, 29; 6 : 61; 6 : 64; 13 : 21; 13 : 36-38; 16 : 16; 16 : 32, 18 : 4; 21 : 17. See FASCHER, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, p. 208: to John, Jesus is "Alleswisser."

³ THOMAS, *Paidika*, 7 : 2. Cf. the findings of the next teachers, cap. 14 and 15 (Hennecke, p. 98 ff.).

⁴ ORIGEN, c. Celsum, II, 15.

⁵ ORIGEN, c. Celsum, II, 18.

⁶ ORIGEN, c. Celsum, II, 20.

happened: "in accordance with the predictions of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ who, by his divine power, foresaw all that as already present."¹ Jesus' words: "Who touched me?," Lk. 8 : 45, are used by TERTULLIAN against the heretic Marcion ostensibly to ascribe to Jesus "ignorance", but in reality to place Him on the same level as the Creator, who once asked: "Where art thou?" of Adam, Gen. 3 : 9.²

The text Gen. 3 : 9 is likewise involved in the discussion between the orthodox Adamantius and Megethius, a Marcionite. The discussion is concerned with Jesus' questions: "Where have you laid him?," Jn. 11 : 34, and "What is thy name?," Lk. 8 : 30. ADAMANTIUS says that God was not questioning Adam, but reminding him with this question of his former happiness.³ Another voice raised in support of Jesus' ignorance is probably that of Porphyry, the man who according to VON HARNACK: "stood in the portal of the Church," but who later regarded the Bible as an enemy to be resisted, for which reason he wrote his fifteen books "Adversus Christianos."⁴ VON HARNACK is of the opinion that it was Porphyry who accused Jesus of unfamiliarity with physics, having regard to the pronouncement that "whatsoever entereth in at the mouth goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught."⁵

We can perceive a certain development in Christology in the method by which this constantly recurring question was handled.⁶ We note that IRENAEUS still adheres to the text when he sees in Mt. 24 : 36 an "admission" by Jesus; the Son "unblushingly shifted the

¹ EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., III, VII, 3.

² TERTULLIAN, Adv. Marc., IV, 20: "Sic et Adam aliquando quaesierat, quasi ignorans, Adam ubi es? Habes et creatorem cum Christo excusatum et Christum creatori adaequatum."

³ ADAMANTIUS, Dial., I, 17.

⁴ VON HARNACK, Porphyrius, p. 3: "Wahrscheinlich kurz vor oder gleich nach dem Tode Plotins (um 270) hat Porphyrius, etwa 40 Jahre alt, die 15 Bücher κατὰ χριστιανῶν im Sizilien geschrieben, unstreitig das umfangreichste und gelehrteste Werk, welches im Altertum gegen das Christentum verfasst worden ist, wenn auch die Gegenschrift des Celsus in mancher Hinsicht bedeutender gewesen zu sein scheint." EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., VI, XIX, 2-9. See also GRANT, Miracle and Natural Law, p. 73 f.

⁵ VON HARNACK, Porphyrius, p. 81 . . . Von Harnack points to Hieronymus, Comm. in Mt., re 15 : 17 ff.: "Omnia evangeliorum loca apud haereticos et perversos plena sunt scandalis, et ex hac sententiola quidam calumniantur, quod dominus, physicae disputationis ignarus, putet omnes cibos in ventrem ire et in secessum digeri." . . . But in that case questions could even be asked about texts such as Mt. 5 : 44, 45 and Jn. 12 : 24, 25!

⁶ See SCHLINGENSIEPEN, Die Wunder des N.T., p. 194 ff.

knowledge of that day to the Father.”¹ But gradually the “men of the Church” keep a respectful distance from those places in the Synoptic Gospels where Jesus’ omniscience seems to be doubted.² When they are discussed, the argumentation is very dubious. An example is the argument put forward by ATHANASIUS in his work against the Arians, in which he maintains that the Son did know the Day of Judgment. How could He otherwise have prophesied to His disciples what would precede that day? When Jesus said that the “son” did not know, he meant His human form. In other words, He does not say that the Son of God did not know, but the son who must be regarded as a son of man.³ When the Father is in the Son and the Son in the Father, must not the Son necessarily know the day? When Jesus said “Watch therefore,” He did not mean: because I do not know, but because you men do not know when your Lord will appear.⁴

The interpretation of the text here is entirely dominated by the dogmatic view and SCHLINGENSIEPEN rightly says that Athanasius twisted the text. Chrysostom, Basil and Gregory also avoided the real meaning of the text; it suited their book to make the Son a son of man, so that His words need not evoke the Son of God.⁵ The

¹ IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, II, 28, 6: “Si igitur scientiam diei illius Filius non erubuit referre ad Patrem, sed dixit quod verum est; neque nos erubescamus, quae sunt in quaestionibus maiora secundum nos, reservare Deo.” Cf. TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Praxean*, 26: “[a Son] who himself does not know of the day and the last hour, of which only the Father knows (. . . ignorans et ipse diem et horam ultimam soli patri notam) . . . CULLMANN, *Die Christologie des N.T.*, p. 276 ff.: Jesus der Gottessohn. With reference to Mk. 13 : 32 and parallel passages, Cullmann remarks that the issue is: “die Beziehung zwischen Vater und Sohn im Blick auf das Heilsgeschehen . . . Das Wort setzt letztlich die Überzeugung von der völligen Einheit zwischen Vater und Sohn als Hintergrund voraus und bekommt erst von daher seinen eigentlichen Sinn. Es nennt den einzigen Punkt, wo diese Einheit innerhalb der Inkarnation Jesu eine Lücke aufweist: das Wissen um das Datum des Endes.” Cullmann considers Mk. 13 : 32 a genuine “Jesus-wort,” also having regard to Mt. 11 : 27.

² Cf. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 492; cf. p. 369 ff., 474, 528.

³ ATHANASIUS, *Contra Arianos oratio*, IV (see *Opera omnia*, I, p. 493 ff.). According to Athanasius nobody may concern himself in inquisitive fashion with the question why Christ did not clearly inform His disciples of what He knew, since He Himself kept silent about this. Athanasius repeatedly refers for his argument to texts such as Lk. 10 : 22 and Jn. 10 : 30, in which the oneness of the Father and the Son is proclaimed.

⁴ According to Athanasius Jesus said this in this way for our sake, and it was no untruth, since He had said it about Himself as a human being. Christ meant: you do not know, but I, who am the Lord, I know when I shall come: “Even though the Arians do not expect me, who am the Word of the Father” (op. cit., p. 501). Cf. EPIPHANIUS, *Adv. haereses*, Lib. II, Tom. II, contra Ariomanitas, XLIII.

⁵ SCHLINGENSIEPEN, op. cit., p. 197 f.

converted pagan ARNOBIUS likewise included His omniscience in his eulogy of Christ.¹ We thus see that the old Church was not able to find a satisfactory solution to the problem of Jesus' knowledge. Exegesis was in the service of dogma. And inevitably opinions still differ. The view of the extent of Jesus' knowledge is closely connected with one's personal ideas about Christ, so that an exegesis satisfying everyone must be regarded as out of the question.

Attempts have been made to view the problem from a different angle. It is pointed out that there are frequent references in Antiquity to persons possessing unusual powers, some even in their youth. Egyptian literature has preserved the story of Senosiris, who at the age of twelve surpassed his teachers, read sealed letters and was able to read unopened any book in his father's library.² FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, who says of himself that at the age of fourteen he was repeatedly consulted by priests and notabilities because of his knowledge of the law, states that there were many Essenes to whom God gave insight into divine matters, because of their righteous way of life. As an example he mentions Menahem, who had received the gift of prophecy from God.³ It is said of various people that they had paranormal gifts, e.g. Simon Magus, Apollonius of Tyana, the martyr Polycarp,⁴ the apostle John,⁵ etc.

¹ ARNOBIUS, *Adv. Gentes*, I, 46: "Was he one of us, who saw clearly in the hearts of the silent what each was pondering, what each had in his secret thoughts?" ... "Was he one of us, who, when he uttered a single word, was thought by nations far removed from one another and of different speech to be using well-known sounds, and the peculiar language of each?" (a speech miracle by Jesus does not occur in the Gospels; there is probably confusion with the Pentecost miracle here).

² MASPERO, *Les contes populaires de l'Egypte ancienne*, p. 155 ff. Satmi, Sénosirus' father, was the wisest man in the world. Sénosirus read the magic books: "et tous ceux qui l'entendaient étaient plongés dans l'étonnement; Satmi se plaisait à le mener à la fête par devant Pharaon, pour que tous les magiciens de Pharaon luttassent contre lui et qu'il leur tint tête à tous" (p. 158). "Quand le petit garçon Sénosiris eut douze ans, il n'y eut scribe ni magicien dans Memphis qui l'égâlât en la lecture des grimoires" (p. 163) ... See also KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, re Lk. 2 : 41-52.

³ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, XV, X, 5 ... Flavius Josephus says of them: "rarely do they err in their prophecies" (*De bello Jud.*, II, VIII, 12). Cf. MEYER, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa*, p. 42 ff., *Essenische Propheten*. As regards rabbinical seers, see p. 58 ff.; the "charismatische Führergestalt" Johannes Hyrcanus I, who had a prophetic eye, p. 60 ff.

⁴ EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, IV, XV, 10 ... Cf. BIELER, *ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ*, p. 87: "Der Θεῖος ἀνὴρ hört und sieht vor allem vieles, was anderen verborgen bleibt." Pythagoras, Plato and others knew and saw things that were concealed.

⁵ ACTA JOH., cap. 46 and 56 (HENNECKE, p. 180). See also SÖDER, *Die*

Parapsychological literature refers to hundreds of cases of supranormal knowledge in later days.¹ However, the final opinion of parapsychological research can only be that Jesus was paranormally gifted, a conclusion which does not in fact help us at all.

We should like to say the following on this matter. Jesus' special knowledge must not be interpreted as an accidental human gift, as extrasensory perception, but as forming part of the essence of the man Jesus as the Son of God. The Gospels certainly do not describe Jesus to us as an "ordinary" man, but nevertheless they do describe Him as a "man."²

When Jesus is elevated to "omniscient," there is the danger of losing oneself in a sea of speculations; one might even go so far as to credit Him as a man with knowing everything that could be known in heaven and on earth. We believe that there can hardly be any insuperable objection to the view that Jesus' empirical knowledge

apokryphen Apostelgeschichten, p. 65, on the "Allwissenheit der Apostel."

¹ Cf. for details among others H. DRIESCH, *Parapsychologie*; TENHAEFF, *Parapsychologische verschijnselen en beschouwingen*; G. ZORAB, *Proscopie*.

² Cf. G. SEVENSTER, *op. cit.*, p. 30, who rightly comments that "we may not think of unlimited knowledge equal to the knowledge and omniscience of the Father." A "subordination of the Son" (p. 30) is evident from both the Synoptic Gospels (see Mk. 10 : 40) and the Gospel of John (see Jn. 5 : 19-20, 30; 14 : 28). KORFF, *Christologie*, I, p. 199, considers the view that Jesus was omniscient a symptom of the lack of appreciation of the true humanity of Jesus Christ. "Even today it is an almost universal idea in orthodox circles that Jesus was omniscient. In the Gospels there is again nothing about such omniscience on the part of Jesus. Without doubt he repeatedly knows more than others in those Gospels; we may sum up as follows: He knows everything that He needs for His work." Cf. II, pp. 162, 224, TAYLOR, *The Person of Christ*. Mk. strongly stresses the "humanity of Jesus" (p. 3 f.); Lk. does so somewhat less strongly (p. 9). But Mk. and Lk. each describe "a truly human life of Jesus" (p. 10). Mt., more than Lk., "softens the bolder realism of St. Mark" (p. 13). Taylor rightly asserts that "some form of kenosis-hypothesis is unavoidable" (p. 272). The problem is that of the coexistence of "very God and very human." In a chapter "Towards a modern Christology" (pp. 286-304), Taylor develops the idea that the Son of God, having become a man: "willed to renounce the exercise of divine prerogatives and powers, so that in the course of His earthly existence, He might live within the necessary limitations which belong to human finitude. Divine attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, and omnipresence were laid aside, not in the sense that they were abandoned or destroyed, but in such a manner that they became potential or latent because no longer in exercise" (p. 287 f.). See also the explanation by BERKOUWER, *De Persoon van Christus*, p. 178 ff. PLUMMER, *St. Luke*, remarks about Lk. 7 : 9: "When Jesus heard these things, he marvelled at him:" "Those who are unwilling to admit any limitations in Christ's knowledge have to explain how wonder is compatible with omniscience. One limitation is clearly told us by Himself (Mk. XIII, 32); so that the only question is how far such limitations extend."

and world of ideas and images were in line with the knowledge of His day.¹ The Gospels nowhere indicate that it was Jesus' intention to enlighten mankind in the fields of science and culture. At all places where mention is made of a special knowledge of Jesus, this is connected with His Messiahship and the Kingdom of God, with His work of salvation, and this knowledge always relates in some way or the other to man.

We considered it necessary to deal at length with Jesus' "knowing," since the opinion held in this respect is very important with regard to the next section.

(g) *The problem of the belief in demons*

Are there disease-producing demons, so that Jesus did in fact cast out demons from men? If they do not exist, why then did Jesus act as if they did? If they do exist, why do we scarcely take their existence into account nowadays, and why does the idea of the influence of demons arouse aversion and resistance, especially in medical circles?²

These questions have brought us to one of the most difficult problems of New Testament science. Attempts have been made in various ways to solve this problem. A number of investigators say that Jesus "erred." Others are of the opinion that He "adapted" Himself. A third group assume that Jesus did in fact expel unclean spirits.

(a) The proponents of the "error" theory argue that all diseases are solely the result of natural causes. When the New Testament

¹ VON SODEN, *Die wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu*, p. 108: "Jesus hat nicht Reisen gemacht und nicht studiert . . . Er ist ein von der übrigen Menschenwelt unberührtes Kind seines Volkes und Landes. Ja, man kann Jesu Horizont vom Kulturstandpunkt aus als einen beschränkten bezeichnen. Mindestens ist nirgends eine Spur zu finden, dass er von der römisch-griechischen Kulturwelt oder von der Entwicklung der Weltgeschichte eine Vorstellung hatte. Er kannte auch keine fremdländische Literatur." Cf. SCHMIEDEL, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 95; SCHUBART, *Das Weltbild Jesu*.

² See the chapter: *Miracles and Medicine*. KOCH, *Seelsorge u. Okkultismus*, p. 229 ff., mentions one of the few psychiatrists: "die ausser den psychiatrischen Krankheitsbildern psychische Störungen auf Grund dämonischer Einflüsse anerkennen," Dr. Lechler. Koch is grateful to Lechler for this. "In theologischer Beziehung hat der Psychiater, Dr. Lechler, der christlichen Seelsorge einen grossen Dienst erwiesen, dadurch, dass er den Nachweis führt, dass die Besessenheitsphänomene des N.T. noch heute in gleichen Krankheitszuständen ihre Parallelen haben. Auch das ist einer der vielen Gegenbeweise zur Bultmannschen Theologie" (p. 231).

speaks of the expulsion of unclean spirits, this must therefore not be interpreted in the strict sense of the words. From the point of view of science Jesus "made a mistake" when He followed the views then held by the masses and practised exorcism.¹

(b) Understandably, many shrank from accusing Jesus of error or mistake. And yet it was considered impossible to assume the objective existence of disease-producing demons. A way out was offered by the accommodation theory, i.e. the assumption that Jesus adapted Himself to the prevalent popular belief. Even the old Church pointed to the divine accommodation of the Son of God. Athanasius and in particular Chrysostom point out that Jesus, when performing His miracles, deliberately adapted Himself to the mental grasp of His disciples.² However, the Fathers of the Church did not doubt the existence of demons.

The concept "accommodation" acquired another accent in the days of rationalism, when the existence of demons was denied and a contrast was seen between the so-called supratemporal truth of the doctrine of Jesus and the contemporary data. The solution was then sought in the view that Jesus adapted Himself to the Jewish ideas of His day from pedagogic motives. It was not Jesus' intention to give mankind a clearer idea of the essence and the laws of nature; He had a higher aim in mind. Moreover, in what way could Jesus successfully have combated the widespread belief in demons?³ In

¹ See among others SMIT, *De Daemoniacis*, p. 167, par. 2, *Theoria erroris Christi* . . . Smit lists the following non-Roman Catholic proponents of this theory: C. F. von Ammon, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, 1843; D. Schenkel, *Das Charakterbild Jesu*, 1864; J. Weiss, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testamentes*, I, 1907 . . . Only few Roman Catholic scholars deny demoniac possession, incl. I. Jahn, *Archeologia biblica*, 1805 (p. 181) . . . Cf. also MONDEN, *Het Wonder, on: Bezetenheid en infestatie*, p. 144 f.

² SCHLINGENSIEPEN, *op. cit.*, p. 179. Cf. RUPPRECHT, *Das Wunder in der Bibel*, p. 167 f. . . . CALVIN says the following about Jesus' "accommodation" in his *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mt. 14 : 36: "*credibile est superstitione aliqua fuisse implicitos quum ad tactum vestis restringerent Christi gratiam . . . Sed ne linum fumigans extinguat, sese accommodat eorum ruditati . . . Tolerata fuit ad tempus eorum infirmitas qui nescientes Christum esse Deum, propius ad eum accedere optarunt.*"

³ See WEHRUNG, *RGG*, I, col. 184. HOFFMANN, *Die Frage nach dem Wesen des Christentums in der Aufklärungstheologie*, p. 358 f.: "Oft half man sich damit, dass man das Lokale und Temporelle als Akkomodation Jesu und der Apostel an ihre Zeitgenossen ansah. Der schon früher gebrauchte Begriff der Akkomodation wurde jetzt häufiger, intensiver und radikaler angewandt und hat bis in die Tage des ausgeprägten Rationalismus hinein eine Rolle gespielt." Cf. VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 382. Jesus took the ground that

his extensive discussion of and attack on this theory, SMIT stresses that belief in demons must not be regarded and tackled as a matter of a scientific nature; the issue is instead an important religious and moral question.¹ For if belief in demons had in fact been based on religious error, would not Jesus have had to combat it with all His might?²

(c) The third point of view, viz. that of the acceptance of the existence of demons causing insanity, is held by the Roman Catholic Church and by much of orthodox Protestantism. Jesus Himself believed in the existence and influence of demons, and smashed their baleful power. CALVIN pours out his wrath on the foolish theory of some godless people who believe that devils are not spirits which really exist but only the corrupt inclinations of men.³ BLUMHARDT reproaches those who deny the occurrence of possession as described in the New Testament. It should be borne in mind what a value Jesus attached to the casting out of devils! Attention should be paid to texts such as Mk. 16 : 17 and Lk. 11 : 20. "Those who are not prepared to judge such references on their value, but even assume that the Lord conformed to the view of those days, must realize how much of the whole Word of God is then taken from us. There

no conversation should be conducted with ecstasies. "Sichtbar handelt hier [Mk. 1 : 21-28] Jesus als Menschenkenner, Weiser und Prophet zu gleicher Zeit." On the strength of deeper interpretation of Scripture and new philosophical and scientific insight, belief in demons can no longer be accepted (p. 385). STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 49, agrees with Paulus and De Wette that exorcism must be explained psychologically.

¹ SMIT, *op. cit.*, p. 178 ff. "Quaestionem de realitate possessionis daemoniacae non esse quaestionem physiologicam, patet etiam ex eo, quod Ecclesia Catholica a primis saeculis usque nunc hanc quaestionem tamquam intime cum religione connexam accepit" (p. 186). Smit refers appreciatively to the views of B. Weiss, *Das Matthäus-Evangelium* (1898), p. 87, who says of this matter that it is: "keineswegs vom religiösen Gebiete abgelegen, und nur physiologischer Art, sondern wesentlich religiösen Natur." Cf. B. Weiss, *Das Leben Jesu*, I, 1902, p. 440. LANGTON, *op. cit.*, p. 156 ff., says that Jesus did accommodate Himself to some extent, in the sense that every religious teacher and leader must do, but he rejects the accommodation theory as such. He thinks that "Jesus shared with the people of His time the beliefs in the existence and operations of evil spirits" (p. 161; cf. p. 222 f.).

² SMIT, *op. cit.*, p. 183: "Nonne omni conatu perversum illum ac funestum errorem ex animis Iudaeorum evellere debuit?"

³ CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mt. 8 : 31: "Docet autem hic locus quam insulse nugentur profani quidam homines, qui diabolos non essentielles spiritus, sed tantum pravos hominum affectus esse fingunt. Quomodo enim avaritia, ambitio, crudelitas, perfidia, in porcos demigrassent?" Cf. *Instit.*, I, XIV, 19.

is thus no other choice: either the stories are accepted as they are, and accordingly given a meaning, or there is no longer any certain word of God and one can believe what one wants."¹

Besides highly positive assertions as the above, we also encounter statements in which hesitation and caution are the dominant factors. In the argument adduced by F. BARTH, which strikes us by the

¹ BLUMHARDT, *Schriftauslegung*, p. 309 f. . . . K. BARTH's view amounts to the following. In K.D., III, 2, p. 729, Barth speaks of Jesus' struggle against and His victory over demons. "Dass die Evangelien im Bereich der Krankheit Dämonen am Werk sehen, das ist nicht nur zeitgeschichtlich bedingt, sondern auch theologisch wichtig: der Messias ist nun einmal der Repräsentant des positiven Willen Gottes, der der Unterwelt schon in ihren Vorposten—das sind die Dämonen!—kämpfend und siegend gegenübertritt. . ." Since Jesus regarded disease as: "ein widernatürliches Übel," as an: "Ausbruch und eine Auswirkung der Dämonenwelt," it would be: "völlig unsinnig die hier in Frage kommenden Aussagen etwa in die harmlosere Sprache moderner Medizin übersetzen zu wollen." In III, 3, p. 608 ff., Barth says what attitude must be adopted towards demons. "Es geht nicht darum, sie [diese Sache] leicht zu nehmen, es geht aber darum, sie so zu behandeln, wie es ihr ihrem Wesen nach zukommt. Gerade ein kurzer scharfer Blick darauf ist für sie nicht nur genügend, sondern auch das einzig Richtige" (p. 609). The Devil and his henchmen must be met with unbelief. "Man kann und darf sie nicht ignorieren" (p. 611). They come from "das Nichtige" and are themselves "das Nichtige" (p. 614). In IV, 2, p. 252 ff., Barth deals at greater length with demonology. According to Barth, we are not concerned in the Gospels with an idea which was then universal, but with something particular that is connected with the: "Schlussetappe der Geschichte Israels," with the: "geistlich-geschichtlich Vakuum" of late Judaism. In those days people saw and experienced most vividly: "die fatale Wirklichkeit des Gegenspielers, den Abgrund, die Finsternis, den Greuel des Bösen als den höchst präsenten Hintergrund des menschlichen Daseins." "Und nun sollte man eben, besonders wenn es um unsere evangelischen Texte geht, von der allzu primitiv subjektivistischen Denk- und Redeweise lassen, laut derer Jesus sich in dieser Sache—nach den alten Rationalisten: der gängigen spätjüdischen 'Vorstellung' pädagogisch angepasst ('akkomodiert') hätte—nach der heute geläufigen Auffassung: selber in dieser Vorstellungsweise befangen gewesen wäre. Es geht hier natürlich *auch* um 'Vorstellungen,' primär und entscheidend aber um objektive *Sachverhalte*, die als solche durch den Aufweis der Grenzen und Bedingtheiten der betreffenden 'Vorstellungen' keineswegs in Frage zu stellen sind" (p. 254). "Die Krankheit redet nicht; der Tod redet auch nicht; die Dämonen aber, die undefinierbaren Konkretionen des undefinierbaren Chaos als die eigentlichen Gegenspieler Gottes und seines Reiches—sie *reden*, sie *schreien*!" (p. 255). Are we correct in assuming that Barth, with these "undefinierbare Konkretionen," is in fact thinking of, does in fact believe in, the existence of objectively present, independent, evil spirits? THURNEYSSEN, *Die Lehre von der Seelsorge*, p. 300 ff., also says that "in allem Ernst" we have to reckon with demons: "aber auch damit, dass sie in Christus an die Leine genommen und in Fesseln gelegt sind" (p. 300). Scripture is concerned with: "einen realen Einbruch von Gewalten in das Leben des Menschen," which cannot be pushed on one side, "jedenfalls nicht einfach als Mythologie" (p. 303). "Es darf sogar gesagt werden, dass es eine integrale und endgültige Besessenheit seit der Erscheinung Jesu Christi auf Erden gar nicht mehr geben kann. Ist doch

sober way in which the problem is set forth and by its critical sense, a certain struggle to think things out is perceptible. BARTH asks if we must still believe in demoniac possession. "Many determined textualists might perhaps feel inclined to do so, but no-one warns against so doing more seriously than experienced psychiatrists. . . Or must we assume that in Jesus' day there were possessed people, but not nowadays? . . . Or did Jesus correctly diagnose possession as mental disease but adapt Himself to the madness of these sick minds, as for instance the psychiatrist accepts and glosses over the delusions of his patient so as not to drive him to a frenzy?" As the ancient world had no knowledge of physiology, Jesus had to consider the possessed as possessed, "in accordance with the general belief of His people, and act accordingly. The question whether their condition might have a physical cause did not exist for Him at all; in this case too He did not ponder scientifically on the 'how,' but was deeply moved by the 'that' and gave it aid.. " ¹ MICKLEM and MACKINNON simply say that Jesus "seems" to have believed that there was something like demoniac possession. ²

der Satan bereits überwältigt und gestürzt durch den Christus (vgl. Mark. 3, 23-27 und Luk. 10, 18-19)" (p. 304). WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 97 ff., wonders how people know that demons do not exist. As far as he knows, "educated members of all branches of the Christian Church" do believe in the existence of angels. "Why should there not be in the universe personalities, other than man, opposed to God and working harm in man?" And what about Eph. 6 : 12? Weatherhead refers to reports from the overseas missions and seances with mediums. Although it may often be doubted whether there really is such a thing as demoniac possession, and although various Biblical data are also subject to doubt, he nevertheless considers that "belief in the possibility of demon possession is not incompatible with the tenets of the Christian religion or contradicted by any reputable scientific research" (p. 107). Nor can Weatherhead deny the Poltergeist phenomena. He thus differs in opinion from Langton, *Essentials of Demonology*, p. 224, where the latter says that Jesus shared the popular belief of his days (p. 108). LANGTON says : "Discarding, as we feel we must, theories of accommodation as insufficient and invalid, we can only conclude that Jesus accepted, without serious modification, the popular belief in Satan and the demons which was current in His time. Such an acceptance by Jesus does not prove that these popular beliefs correspond with reality." See also TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 83.

¹ BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 129 ff.

² MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 40: "Our Lord, however, seems to have believed that there was such a thing as demon possession. Indeed it appears that He felt the casting out of demons to be a messianic function." MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 358: "Jesus seems to have shared the current belief in demonology." . . . GUIGNEBERT, *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus*, p. 105: "As for Jesus himself, there can be no doubt that he was born and bred and lived out his life in the midst of a threatening cloud of hostile spirits,

Now what is the truth? Do demons who can make men mentally ill exist objectively, so that Jesus rightly recognized their existence? Or do they not exist, and was Jesus aware of this, although for various reasons He adapted Himself to the prevailing popular belief? Or do they not exist, and did Jesus not know that they do not exist, any more than His compatriots did?

Jesus' "knowing" thus forms an important point here. In the preceding section we spoke of the limits to His knowledge, i.e. the Gospels themselves indicate a limit. However, nobody will ever be able to say where the limits lie, and any speculation on this can be disputed. Consequently, for our personal explanation we shall not choose our starting point in a matter which is in itself already uncertain, but shall proceed from the whole of Jesus' teaching and activities. The Gospels show that Jesus, in His teaching on the "supernatural"—if the term may be permitted—remained within the limits of the Jewish world of ideas.¹ For instance, when He speaks of "sitting down" with the patriarchs in the Kingdom of Heaven, Mt. 8 : 11, we are not concerned with whether Jesus did not "know" that this was a material representation; the essential element must be distinguished from the picture; the first is primary, the representation is secondary.

When Jesus drives out evil spirits, he breaks the power of Satan. The latter is primary: Jesus advances to meet Satan and gains the victory.² The material conception of that power, viz. that it manifested itself in the appearance of independent, malignant spirits, is secondary. These figures, in their material representation, were terrible realities for the people of those days. Here too the issue is not whether Jesus did not "know" that this was a material representation. In

and that belief in their existence and in their activities was one of the formative elements in his religious experience." KRAUSS, art. Jesus of Nazareth in *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*, VII, p. 161: "It would appear that Jesus shared in the current belief of the Jews in the noumenal existence of demons or evil spirits." HAUCK, *TWNT*, I, p. 525, speaks of: "Jesus, der in der Dämonenvorstellung mit seiner Zeit zusammengeht . . ."

¹ See inter alia Mt. 8 : 11, 12; Mt. 13 : 42; Mt. 19 : 28; Mt. 26 : 29; Lk. 22 : 30. Cf. the commentaries of STRACK-BILLERBECK; ALLEN; KLOSTERMANN, and others. H. RIESENFELD, *The Mythological Background of New Testament Christology* (in *The Background of the N.T. and its Eschatology*) makes a passing reference in his argument to the Palestinian and old Testament background of the expressions and symbols used by Jesus, and then says: "As to the formal side of his preaching and acting, he was deeply rooted in the milieu where he lived" (p. 90).

² Cf. the chapter: Relations involved in the Miracles of Jesus.

His healings of the mentally sick Jesus smashed the reality of Satan's power by attacking it in the material conception which people of that time had of it and by "commanding" the unclean spirits to leave their victims. SMIT has said that here we are on religious ground. In our view we are in the material world of ideas about the supernatural, and belief in the existence of independent disease-producing demons who suddenly pounce on their victims, establish themselves in them and bring them to ruin must be understood as a view bound up with those days. We therefore cannot share the view of BAVINCK, who is of the opinion that the possessed of the New Testament were no ordinary sick persons, even though symptoms of disease, such as deafness, dumbness, epilepsy, lunacy, etc., sometimes occurred in them.¹ This view, in which as it were a separate class of mental patients is suggested, seems to us untenable, having regard to what we are told about possession from other sources. We are concerned with the mentally ill as they are encountered everywhere and at all times.² Medical specialists may concern themselves with the extent to which the data in the New Testament offer material for making a probable diagnosis.

Although we shall deal at greater length elsewhere with the relation between sin and disease, it is desirable at this point to return briefly to what we said about Jesus' overcoming the power of Satan. We must not regard "possession" as an additional assault by Satan, nor must we allow ourselves to be tempted into speculation on possible special sins and special punishments of the victims; we

¹ BAVINCK, *Geref. Dogmatiek*, III, p. 197. Bavinck says that when Christ appeared on earth, Satan "concentrated" his power against Him by surrounding and combating Him on all sides with demoniac forces. The "special" aspect of these demoniacs, says Bavinck, was "that out of them another subject speaks than they themselves, that this subject recognizes Jesus as the Son of God, is entirely inimical to Him and leaves the sufferer at His command only."

² See OESTERREICH, *Die Besessenheit*. Cf. KOCH, *Seelsorge u. Okkultismus*, p. 232. HAMER, *Zielszorg en Psychiatrie*, p. 13 ff., does not wish to go into the theological side of the problem of possession, but his argument is clear enough and he warns the pastor in valuable fashion to be cautious. Devils do not observe the laws of heredity and are not susceptible to shock treatment! KLOEK, *De verhouding van geloof en medische wetenschap*, p. 38 f., says that the medical man becomes rather irritated when he reads what theological literature has to say about the possessed. People who lose their personal character:—"perhaps we recognize our schizophrenes or our maniacs in them—are they, and they in particular, possessed by demons? Would it not have been much more honest to have clearly established here that the gospel speaks in the language of its own time of the mentally ill and epileptics, and then to have recognized that we do not know what to do with demons?" Cf. LANGTON, p. 151 ff.

must regard the healings of the mentally sick as part of the whole of Jesus' activities. The coming of the Kingdom of God in Jesus Christ means the unmasking and expulsion of all powers of the Prince of Darkness, the overthrow of his rule,¹ and the healing of the mentally deranged and other sick persons is just as much a part of this as the teaching of the disciples and the multitudes and the disputations with the Jewish leaders. We wish to specify this quite explicitly, since the seriousness and the mostly violent nature of mental disease all too often create the impression of a diabolical "extra."

We are aware that our point of view may be regarded as unacceptable, or at least as open to dispute; after all, a common opinion will never be arrived at in this very difficult matter on the strength of the New Testament data as they have been handed down to us. But we believe that we must resist the view that, when a person can no longer share this part of an ancient, material, mental world, he no longer has a "certain word of God" (Blumhardt), or simply capitulates to the view of modern science.²

(h) *Healing and the Sabbath*

On a number of occasions the Gospels refer to healings on the Sabbath and the serious conflicts that were the result. Clashes occur

¹ See STAUFFER, *Die Theologie des N.T.*, p. 103 ff. Satan throws in everything and everyone against Christ and His Kingdom; the pious, divines, priests, the treachery of His own disciple, the people, the Roman governor. But Christ is more than a match for His opponent. "Die Allgewalt der Civitas Diaboli ist erschüttert. Die Civitas Dei muss im Anbruch sein! Das Reich ist da, aber es ist noch nicht vollendet (Mk. 9, 1; 13, 26; Ap. 11, 15; 12, 10). Der Feind ist geschlagen, aber noch nicht vernichtet!" NOACK, *Satanas u. Soteria*, par. 5, *Der Kampf Jesu gegen die dämonischen Mächte*, p. 65 ff. . . . "An und für sich ist die ganze neutestamentliche Dämonologie durch die Eschatologie bestimmt, sofern die Kirche überzeugt ist, in den letzten Zeiten zu leben" (p. 114).

² See for instance KLAAS, *Der moderne Mensch in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns*, p. 6: "Wissenschaft und Technik in ihrer neuesten Entwicklung verbieten es dem Menschen von heute, sich Gott, die Engel, die Dämonen, den Satan und die Hölle, den Himmel und den Erlöser so primitiv vorzustellen, wie dies früher geschah. Das Zeitalter des elektrischen Lichtes, des Radio, des Funks, des Fernsehens, der zentral geleiteten Propaganda entrückt den Menschen automatisch der Sphäre, den Vorstellungen und Begriffen des mythischen Weltbildes aus der Zeit des Neuen Testaments." A different opinion is held by MONDEN, *Het Wonder*. "The difference between psychopathological demonopathies and actual possession is rather a matter of that 'distinction of the spirits' which Christian spirituality has worked out in the course of the centuries with such supernatural feeling and such quiet modesty and discernment. Only this spiritual Geiger counter can register the Satanic radiations of phenomena which clinically seem entirely to coincide with familiar symptoms of disease" (p. 150).

when there are differences of opinion, and the Sabbath conflict is part of the great conflict between Jesus and the leaders of the Jews on the study and interpretation of the law of God. On one occasion a "work" of Jesus' disciples on the sabbath, viz. plucking the ears of corn, gave rise to a conflict.¹ This was interpreted as Sabbath-breaking, since plucking the ears of corn was regarded as a method of harvesting; see Deu. 23 : 25.² Jesus answered the accusation of the Pharisees by appealing to Holy Writ. A number of references are made to healings on the Sabbath.³ The practice of medicine on Sabbath days was also regulated. The criterion was the fact or possibility of the patient's life being in danger. If this was so, aid could be given in accordance with the rule: "any danger to life ousts the Sabbath."⁴ But the scribes had laid down in precisely which cases one could speak of immediate danger to life, and to what extent aid could be given.

If we consider Jesus' healings, we see that in no single case was there any question of immediate danger to life. They related to the healing of a withered hand, Mt. 12 : 10 and parallel passages; of paralysis, Lk. 13 : 11 and Jn. 5 : 5; of dropsy, Lk. 14 : 2, and of blindness, Jn. 9 : 1. It is important to investigate the conversations relating to these healings. According to Mt. 12 : 10, Jesus was asked in the synagogue: "Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath days?" The addition: "that they might accuse him" points to the Pharisees

¹ Mt. 12 : 1-8; Mk. 2 : 23-28; Lk. 6 : 1-5.

² The scribes had drawn up a list of the many kinds of work that were forbidden on the Sabbath. The principal forbidden activities, 39 in number, were further supplemented by all kinds of subsidiary work. Casuistry has a heyday here. A good survey is given by SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, II, p. 470 ff. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 615 ff., gives references . . . For Jesus' attitude to the Law, see among others VAN RULER, *De vervulling van de Wet*; DE BEUS, *Jezus en de Wet*.

³ Mt. 12 : 9-14; Mk. 3 : 1-6; Lk. 6 : 6-11; Lk. 13 : 10-17; Lk. 14 : 1-6; Jn. 5 : 1-18; Jn. 9 : 1-41; cf. Jn. 7 : 22-24 . . . LOHSE, *TWNT*, VII, p. 21 ff., is of the opinion that it is evident from the disputes between Jesus and the Pharisees on keeping the Sabbath in the Gospel of Mt.: "dass sich die Gemeinde des Mt noch in Streitgesprächen über den Sabbat mit der Synagoge befand" (p. 24, note 195). For Lk. and his fellows the Sabbath question was no longer a topical one. From what Lk. writes about this—and he writes more than the other Evangelists—it is evident that after rejection of Jesus' message by the synagogue salvation comes to the pagans. It may be derived from the Gospel of John that by the end of the first century the keeping of the Sabbath was already a closed question for the community (see Jn. 5 : 18). "Und die Gemeinde, die sich zu ihm bekennt, ist vom Sabbat befreit wie er" (p. 28).

⁴ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 623 ff.

having asked the question for a deliberate purpose. Jesus' answer, in which the saving of animals and men is compared, did not satisfy the Pharisees. Here two different "ways of thought" came face to face. In Mk. 3 : 4, cf. Lk. 6 : 9, Jesus asks: "Is it lawful to do good on the sabbath days, or to do evil? to save life, or to kill?" The silence of the Pharisees is understandable, since the law was not opposed to the saving of a life on the sabbath.¹

But the healing in question could, according to the Pharisees, easily have waited until the next day.² On the occasion of another healing on the Sabbath the ruler of the synagogue points explicitly to this postponement when Jesus, now without prior discussion, heals a woman who had been bowed together for eighteen years. "There are six days in which men ought to work: in them therefore come and be healed, and not on the sabbath day," Lk. 13 : 14. In the healing of the man with dropsy, the situation—Jesus was being closely watched—caused Him to ask: "Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day?," Lk. 14 : 3. In neither of the two cases mentioned by John does a discussion take place before the healing; the circumstances were different in these cases. It strikes us that in these two healings a double breach of the Sabbath occurred. Firstly, the healings could have been postponed, since there was no immediate danger to life. In the second place both Jesus and the healed paralytic were guilty of forbidden work, for at Jesus' command the healed paralytic took up his bed, Jn. 5 : 8, 9, and this was forbidden on the Sabbath.³ For the healing of the man born blind Jesus used a mixture of spittle and clay, Jn. 9 : 6 and 14. Both the kneading and preparing of a

¹ Cf. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 279: "There was no reason for Jesus (or the author of the Gospel) to ask the Pharisees, 'Is it lawful on the Sabbath to save life or to destroy it?', since the saving of life most certainly abrogates the Sabbath laws, as we have seen; but the reason for the Pharisees' indignation was, undoubtedly, that Jesus healed on the Sabbath regardless of the nature of the illness, whether it was dangerous or not."

² See the regulations in cases of dislocation. Shabbath XXII: "If one's hand or foot is dislocated, he must not agitate it violently in cold water but may bathe it in the usual way, and if it heals, it heals" (ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman).

³ See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 454 ff. The last of the 39 activities forbidden on the Sabbath was the carrying of objects from one place to the other (Shabb. VII, 2). In all kinds of ways "exceptions" to this were sought. The Jews accused the healed paralytic of Sabbath-breaking, Jn. 5 : 10, because he had carried his mattress. According to Shabb. X, 5 a living person may be carried on a bed, since the bed is then regarded as an "appendage" of the person being carried. If, therefore, the healed man had carried a living person on his bed, he would have committed no offence! (see Strack-Billerbeck, II, p. 461).

pulpy mass and the use of those ointments which served for healing came under the heading of work forbidden on the Sabbath, so that Jesus was guilty of a whole string of offences.¹

As we have already mentioned, the Sabbath conflict did not originate in subordinate departures from tradition, but was symptomatic of Jesus' whole attitude towards the law. Viewed in this light, the healings on the Sabbath therefore display a separate, independent character among the healings.²

Jesus' personal testimony, which is preserved in Jn. 7:14-24, forms an important pointer to Jesus' views on the Sabbath. Jesus reproaches the Jews with not keeping the law given by Moses. He recalls the one "work" done by Him at which they all marvelled.³ He refers to circumcision, which is permitted on the Sabbath, though work is performed in the process! Now if the importance of circumcision justified a breach of the Sabbath commandment, why should "the making of a man every whit whole" not be permitted on the Sabbath? Although statements of similar purport are also credited to rabbis,⁴ the great difference is and remains the fact that Jesus does

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 530. As No. 10 of the 39 forbidden activities kneading is mentioned (Shabb. VII, 2, see Strack-Billerbeck, I, p. 616). According to Shabb. XXIV, 3, it is permitted to pour water on bran, but stirring is forbidden . . . One may anoint oneself on the Sabbath with salves used during the week, but not with salves which are medicinal. As spittle was no ordinary salve, a diseased part of the body could not be smeared with it on the Sabbath. Shabbath 108b: "To put tasteless saliva, ¹) even on the eye, is forbidden" (ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman).

² Cf. PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 9: "Dabei sind drei verschiedene Logien überliefert, mit denen Jesus das Recht und die Pflicht zur Sabbatheilung begründet."

³ By this "one work" Jesus means the healing of the paralytic at Bethesda, which so offended the Jews that they wanted to prosecute Him for it, Jn. 5:16. BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 208, says that this "work" does not mean Jesus' miraculous feat, but: "Jesu Verletzung des Sabbat."

⁴ Shabbath XVIII: "And all the requirements of circumcision may be done on the Sabbath" (ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman). See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 487 f., for further provisions . . . As regards "the whole body," see Yoma 85b: "R. Eleazar answered and said: If circumcision, which attaches to one only of the two hundred and forty-eight members of the human body, suspends the Sabbath, how much more shall [the saving of] the whole body suspend the Sabbath!" (ed. Epstein; transl. L. Jung) . . . PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, discusses in detail "Die Teile des Körpers und ihre Verrichtungen" (pp. 43-157). . . . SEESEMAN, *TWNT*, V, p. 175, interprets the concept *δλον ἀνθρώπου*, Jn. 7:23, in a broad sense: "durch die Heilung hat Jesus den Kranken in seinem ganzen Sein gesund gemacht." He points out that there is no proof that the Jews interpreted circumcision as "healing."

¹) i.e. saliva of a person who has tasted nothing after sleeping.

not observe the traditional rules, but looks at the sick person and heals him or her.

We have already pointed to the difference in "way of thought." After all, to the Pharisees Jesus' activities meant nothing less than the undermining of their interpretation of the law, of their piety and their actions.¹ Jesus, on the other hand, did not regard the Sabbath as a precisely regulated span of time. "The sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath. Therefore the Son of man is Lord also of the sabbath," Mk. 2 : 27, 28. With this view Jesus overstepped a mark, to the way of thinking of the Pharisees, which could not be overstepped. He undermined the piety of the law and broke the tradition. Authority confronted authority. But in His healings on the Sabbath, in which His full power, His "I say unto you," manifested itself, Jesus did not break the law, but fulfilled it, did full justice to its essence.² "For he did not annul the law, but fulfilled it, when he completed the works of the High Priest by making God favourably disposed towards men and cleansing lepers, healing the weak and dying himself, so that repudiated man might escape condemnation and return without delay to his inheritance," as IRENAEUS very rightly says in a passage on the Sabbath.³

The characteristic element of the healings on the Sabbath is there-

¹ See KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 279. The Pharisees observed that Jesus was not a rabbi who advocated any personal views, but that he was "in real truth, a danger to religion and to ancestral tradition." Cf. W. G. KÜMMEL, *Jesus u. der Jüdische Traditionsgedanke*, ZNW, 33e Band, 1934, pp. 105-130. The Pharisees did not understand that Jesus recognized the law and nevertheless set aside traditional Jewish ideas.

² W. G. KÜMMEL, *op. cit.*, p. 128: "Jesus wollte das Gesetz nicht beseitigen, vielmehr wollte er durch seine Botschaft vom Willen Gottes den wahren Sinn des Gesetzes aufzeigen." GOPPELT, *Christentum u. Judentum*, p. 46 f.: "Jesus hebt somit das Sabbatgebot auf in einer neuen totalen Forderung und in einer neuen Erfüllung von Gottes Willen, die zuerst durch ihn selbst geschieht. Jesu Stellungnahme ist nicht allgemein geltende Regel, sondern fordert Stellungnahme zu seiner Person. Die Pharisäer vollziehen diese, indem sie beschliessen, Jesus wegen seiner Stellung zum Sabbat zu töten (Mk. 3, 6 par)" . . . Cf. VAN RULER, *De vervulling van de Wet*, p. 335: "It is not the law itself but the piety which has taken possession of the law of God which is hard-hit by his judgment" . . . TÖDT, *Der Menschensohn in der synopt. Überlieferung*: "—in Mk. 2, 28 wird ein grundsätzliches Herr-Sein des Menschensohnes über die heilige Gottesordnung des Sabbat ausgesagt" (p. 122). Tödt sees in Mt. 12 : 5, 6, 41 an important contribution towards the interpretation of Mk. 2 : 28.

³ IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, IV, 8, 2: "Non enim solvebat, sed adimplebat legem, summi sacerdotis operam perficiens, propitiatus pro hominibus Deum et emundans leprosos, infirmos curans, et ipse moriens, uti exsiliatus homo exiret de condemnatione, et reverteretur intrepide ad suam hereditatem."

fore vested in a dual function of the Kingdom of God, viz. one with respect to the healing and one with respect to the Sabbath itself.¹ In the Sabbath conflict the divergency between the Jewish view of justice through the works of the law and the coming of Jesus as Lord and Bringer of the Kingdom of Love and Service comes to the fore in all its intensity. It is precisely in the light of the real meaning of the Sabbath that man's misery, that is to say his physical suffering as well, as the work of the Prince of Darkness, is thrown into relief in a special manner; see Lk. 13 : 16.

In dual fashion, therefore, the coming of the Kingdom of God is proclaimed in the healings on the Sabbath, for Jesus, the "Lord" of the Sabbath, "delivers" both the Sabbath and mankind from a state of distress!

(i) *The miraculous power of the disciples*

Around the person of Jesus as Lord and Master is a circle of pupils, who have been authorized by Him to work signs and miracles. In the New Testament it is still a limited group of men who live in direct contact with Jesus; in old Christian literature this circle begins to widen and we find miracles and signs described everywhere, until gradually the violent wave of miracles lessens in force to a ripple, and the Church itself is manifested as *the* Miracle. The following points deserve attention in our investigation:

1. The data in Acts and the Epistles.
2. Jesus' instructions.
3. Comparison between the miracles of Jesus and those of the disciples.
4. Data from the Apocrypha.
5. Data from old Christian writings.
6. The end of the period of miracles.

¹ VAN RULER, op. cit., p. 332: "In his works on the Sabbath Jesus lays a very strong stress on man's need, which is relieved, and thus on doing good, healing, saving." BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, says that Jesus healed: "zwar nicht immer, aber mit Bewusstsein und gerne gerade am Sabbat" since with His coming: "der siebente, der letzte Tag, der 'grosse Tag Jahves' angebrochen war und weil eben heilen das spezifische Wort Gottes war, das an diesem Tag (im Namen Gottes und als Vollstrecker von dessen eigenem Werk) zu tun er gekommen war. So dass gerade er es war, der den Sabbat mit diesem seinen Tun nicht nur nicht gebrochen, sondern aufs Höchste heilig gehalten und gefeiert hat!" (p. 251).

1. Acts make mention of *many signs* performed by the apostles. There are various general references to miracles, particularly healings.¹ More details are given of a number of cures: healings performed by Peter² and Paul.³ The apostles performed several punitive miracles. Peter pronounced the doom of Ananias and Sapphira, Ac. 5 : 1-11; Paul afflicted the Jew Bar-jesus with blindness at Paphos on Cyprus, Ac. 13 : 11, whilst at Philippi he drove a spirit of divination out of a woman, Ac. 16 : 16-18. Other miracles also occurred. The apostles were freed from prisons in wonderful fashion;⁴ Paul did not die when a viper bit him, Ac. 28 : 1-6. On numerous other occasions the element of the wonderful manifested itself.⁵

Several references are made in the Epistles to the miraculous power of the apostles. Paul speaks of "mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God," Ro. 15 : 19. He mentions "the gifts of healing," 1 Co. 12 : 9, "signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds," 2 Co. 12 : 12. He. 2 : 4 tells how God bears witness to the word "with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will." It is the unanimous testimony of Acts and the Epistles that the proclamation of the gospel by the apostles was accompanied by many signs and wonders, with a display of powers, which did not fail to make a great impression on Jew and pagan and induced many to embrace the new faith.⁶

2. As already mentioned, this miraculous power of the apostles was inseparably bound up with the *instructions and authority* which Jesus had given them. The discourse to the disciples before they are sent

¹ Ac. 2 : 43; 5 : 12-16 (signs and wonders; Peter's shadow); Ac. 6 : 8 (Stephen's wonders and miracles); Ac. 8 : 6-8, 13 (Philip's miracles); Ac. 14 : 3 (wonders of Paul and Barnabas); Ac. 28 : 9 (healings on Malta).

² Ac. 3 : 1-10 (healing of a lame man by Peter and John); Ac. 9 : 33-35 (healing of Aeneas, who was sick of the palsy, at Lydda); Ac. 9 : 36-42 (raising of Tabitha at Joppa).

³ Ac. 14 : 8-10 (healing of a cripple at Lystra); Ac. 19 : 11, 12 (healing by handkerchiefs or aprons); Ac. 20 : 9-12 (resurrection of Eutychus at Troas); Ac. 28 : 8-10 (healing of the father of Publius on Malta).

⁴ Ac. 5 : 17-20 (liberation of the apostles); Ac. 12 : 1-19 (liberation of Peter); Ac. 16 : 19-40 (the earthquake in Philippi and its consequences for Paul and Silas, who were in prison at the time).

⁵ Ac. 6 : 15 (Stephen's face was *ὡσεὶ πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου*); Ac. 8 : 39 (Philip's sudden disappearance); Ac. 9 : 3-9 (Saul's conversion, cf. 22 : 6-16; 26 : 12-18); Ac. 14 : 19-20 (Paul's rapid recovery after being stoned at Lystra); Ac. 27 : 14-44 (the shipwreck).

⁶ See also 1 Co. 2 : 4; 2 Co. 6 : 7; 2 Co. 12 : 1 ff.; Gal. 3 : 5; 1 Th. 1 : 5; 2 Tim. 4 : 17.

forth, Mt. 10 and parallel passages, begins with the statement that Jesus called His twelve disciples to Him and gave them power "against unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease." "Preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils: freely ye have received, freely give," are the direct instructions that Jesus gives His disciples.¹ The "seventy" whose sending forth is reported by Luke likewise received the power to heal the sick and to tread on serpents and scorpions.² Before His death, Jesus promised His disciples that they would perform many signs: casting out evil spirits, speaking with new tongues, taking up snakes, and drinking poison without harm to themselves, whilst they would lay hands on the sick and heal them.³ The disciples would be clothed "with power from on high," Lk. 24 : 49, a promise which was fulfilled during the feast of Pentecost at Jerusalem, Ac. 2. John recorded a statement by Jesus which deserves special attention. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father," Jn. 14 : 12. Jesus asks His disciples to believe in His oneness with the Father, adding: "or else believe me for the very works' sake," Jn. 14 : 11. And then He speaks of the "greater works" of the disciples. What did Jesus mean by this? Some have thought of greater miracles which the apostles were to perform and therefore have pointed to Ac. 5 : 15, 19 : 12, the speaking with tongues, etc. Others think of the geographical limita-

¹ Mt. 10 : 7, 8; cf. Mk. 6 : 7-13; Lk. 9 : 1-6. See likewise Mk. 3 : 14, 15 . . . EITREM, *Demonology*, thinks of two formulae which the disciples may have used: (a) "in the name of Jesus, go out, etc.," see Mt. 7 : 22; Mk. 16 : 17; Ac. 3 : 6; 16 : 18; (b) "Jesus Christ maketh thee whole," Ac. 9 : 34. "At any rate a traditional, for ever fixed formula prescribed by Jesus apparently did not exist" (p. 7).

² Lk. 10 : 1-20 . . . There is considerable difference of opinion about the meaning of the number 70 (72), see KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*. In later times it was believed that some of these apostles could be identified; among others, Barnabas (Ac. 4 : 36), Sosthenes (1 Co. 1 : 1), Cephas (a different one from Peter), Matthias, Joseph Barsabas and Thaddeus were said to have belonged to this circle, see EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, I, XII. Cf. HENNECKE, *Neutestam. Apokr.*, 125 f., for further information.

³ Mk. 16 : 17-20 . . . The problem of the authenticity of the conclusion of Mark may be left out of consideration here, since what is mentioned here does not differ from what is recounted elsewhere. BARTH, K.D., II, 2, says that after His resurrection Jesus did no further miracles, and also the disciples had at that time no further instructions to heal, Mt. 28. Barth considers the fact that Mk. 16 : 17-20 does speak of such instructions an "inhaltliches Merkmal" for the falseness of these verses (p. 496).

tions (Palestine) and the national ties (Israel) of Jesus' activities on earth, whilst after His death and resurrection the gospel spread throughout the world. In that case the results of the missionary work among the Jews and pagans would be the "greater works" meant by Jesus.¹ BULTMANN rejects all these views and seeks the solution in Jesus' added comment: "because I go unto my Father." Attention should be paid to the eschatological significance of the "greater works" as they are described in Jn. 16 : 8-11; the death of Jesus is a condition precedent to the coming of the Comforter. These are the greater works: "which become possible on the ground of his going."² However, this solution does not fit in with Jesus' words: "believe me for the very works' sake," while BULTMANN wrongly identifies "word" with "work."³ We share BULTMANN's opinion that the key to interpretation of the text is given in Jesus' words: "because I go unto my Father," but we believe that to understand the "greater works" aright attention must be paid to other statements in which Jesus likewise speaks of greater things or

¹ See for instance KEULERS, JOANNES. LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle*, p. 530: the spiritual works of the disciples are in the course of time: "destinées à surpasser les merveilles opérées par Lui sur les corps et sur la nature sensible." Cf. p. 395. . . ORIGEN, c. Celsum, II, 48, thinks that the disciples did "greater things" than those perceptible by the senses that Jesus did," e.g. healing spiritual blindness and deafness, etc. Cf. BARRETT, St. John. John doubtless accepted the miracles of his day, but he regarded the "works": "primarily as acts in which the power and character of God are made known; cf. 13. 15, 35. The greater works therefore are the gathering of many converts into the Church through the activity of the disciples (cf. 17. 20; 20. 29)." These greater works are "directly dependent upon the 'going' of Jesus."

² BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 471 f. Cf. BRAUN, TWNT, VI, p. 480: "Ja gerade das durch Jesu Fortgang zum Vater endgültige Indirektwerden der Offenbarung macht den Glaubenden so sehr zum Teilhaber an der Existenz Jesu, dass der Glaubende die gleichen, ja grössere Werke als Jesus tut (J 14, 12): grösser nicht im Sinne quantitativer Ergänzung oder Überbietung, sondern weil das zeitlich begrenzte Sein des Offenbarers in der Welt seine Sinnerfüllung (allerdings eine genau so indirekte wie beim Offenbarer selber) erst erhält in der Schar der Glaubenden, in der das Offenbarungsgeschehen immer neu gegenwärtig ist."

³ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 471: "Diese έργα können ja nach V. 10 nichts anderes sein als Jesu Offenbarerwirken im Worte." But cf. BERTRAM, TWNT, II, p. 639: the "works" as deeds of salvation of God through Christ are designated in Jn. 5 : 20, 36; 7 : 3, 21; 9 : 3, 4; 10 : 25, 32, 37, 38; 14 : 10, 11, 12; 15 : 24. "Diese Aussagen beziehen sich auf die einzelnen Wundertaten, die Jesus tut." . . . A more extensive view of the "works" is that of E. Hirsch, *Das vierte Evangelium*, 1936, p. 161. He says: "Man verwechsle Jesu 'Werke' nicht mit seinen Zeichen. Die Werke greifen über die Zeichen hinüber, umfassen sie insofern mit, sind aber sein ganzes Tun an uns" (see GRUNDMANN, TWNT, IV, p. 543, note 39. Cf. what Grundmann says about the concept μέγας in John).

works. Nathanael and the disciples will "see greater things than these," viz. "heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man," Jn. 1 : 50, 51. The Father will show the Son "greater works than these," for the Son "quickeneth whom he will," Jn. 5 : 20, 21. And so, since Jesus Himself wishes to make this possible by returning to His Father, the disciples will also do "greater works" through the Spirit of the exalted Christ, in which signs, miracles and proclamation of the gospel to Jews and heathens are included. The stress falls not so much on the measuring of the works as on the promise that they will occur; for the "greater works" are in reality Jesus' works!

The instructions and authority to perform miracles and signs thus come clearly to the fore in the four Gospels. Just as Moses, Elijah, Elisha and others were messengers of the Lord, through whose action events occurred which only God can perform, so the disciples were messengers of Jesus, who could perform their signs and miracles only in His name and through His power, and who had been authorized to do so by Jesus Himself.¹ The miracles were therefore not works or signs which happened for the sake of the apostles, but originated in the point at issue, viz. the proclamation of salvation by Jesus Christ and the coming of His Kingdom. They did not accompany the preaching of the gospel as incidentals, but formed an integral part of it; in the healing, as a visible function of the Kingdom of God, something that could be experienced, God's will to heal the whole of man was manifested. In this very respect RENGSTORF has very rightly raised the question of the historical reliability of the

¹ FRÖVIG, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu als Lehrer und Wundertäter*, p. 52: "Es verdient bemerkt zu werden, dass Sendboten jüdischer Betrachtung nach nicht nur Boten sind, sondern auch Vollmacht haben." See Mt. 10 : 40, Ac. 9 : 2 . . . Cf. RENGSTORF, TWNT, I, p. 406 ff. The apostles are the bearers of the New Testament proclamation. "Vorausgesetzt ist die Sendung durch Jesus" (p. 422). "Zur Beauftragung mit dem Wort tritt, unlöslich mit ihr verbunden, schon bei Jesus die Bevollmächtigung seiner Boten zur Tat. Auch sie gehört zum Wesen der Dinge, da in ihr der Bote selbst den Erweis hat und liefert, dass er wirklich Jesu Beauftragter ist und ihn vertritt" (p. 430). BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 97: "Jesus ist und bleibt der Wundertäter, und seine Apostel sind nur seine Vermittler." GRUNDMANN, TWNT, II, p. 311: "In Jesu Kraft treten die Apostel an Jesu Stelle und setzen seine Tätigkeit fort." HEMPEL, *Heilung als Symbol u. Wirklichkeit im bibl. Schrifttum*, p. 301: "Wie sich in den Heilungen Jesu Verheissungen des AT erfüllen und er selbst in solcher Erfüllung legitimiert wird (Matth. 11₂ ff. par.; Mk 7₃₁ ff.; Jes. 35₆, 61₁), so erfüllen sich in den Heilungen der Jünger die Verheissungen, die man von Jesus überlieferte und legitimieren sie so als Fortsetzer seines Streites und seines Sieges."

miracle stories in Acts. If these accounts are to be excised or stigmatized as legends, the same will also have to be done with the miracles of Jesus, since the latter are inseparably bound up with the former.¹

Now the question arises of how we must visualize this miraculous power. GRUNDMANN has tried to make this clear in the following way. He regards Christ as the "giver of power," who presents His apostles with an "essence of power." According to Lk. 9 : 1 the disciples received "power and authority," which according to GRUNDMANN means "plenary power" plus a "superior essence of power." Now this power had to be absorbed somewhere, viz. in faith. "The receiving organ is faith, i.e. the strictly personal relation to God and his Christ."² Jesus does not present His disciples with a magic power or an automatically working force, but gives them divine power to overcome the power of Satan.³

This is bringing us dangerously near to the notion of mana. When faith is formulated as the "receiving organ," the impression may be created of a transfer of power. But this is precisely what is not said in the New Testament. When the "seventy" have returned, they say to Jesus: "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through

¹ RENGSTORF, TWNT, I, p. 434: "Ist 'der Bote eines Menschen wie er selbst' und basiert auf diesem Satze der ntliche Apostolat, so würde das Fehlen des Wunders nicht weniger als die erwiesene Unrechtmässigkeit des apostolischen Anspruchs bedeuten und die Predigt von dem auferstandenen Christus als Menschengedanken, nicht aber als Botschaft von der alles menschliche Denken überbietenden Gottestat erscheinen lassen." Cf. FRIEDRICH, TWNT, II, p. 717, on the combination of word and work in the bringing of the gospel. G. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v. h. N.T.*, p. 33, points to the state of salvation that Jesus brings. "Here, therefore, we must seek the reason why the disciples can perform miracles. In them, too, healing and the expulsion of disease are most intimately bound up with the proclamation entrusted to them: 'the Kingdom of God is come'."

² GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 93. Grundmann invokes for this Mk. 9 : 14 ff.

³ GRUNDMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 92 ff. . . . With regard to Ac. 28 : 3-6, Grundmann remarks: "Die Vorstellung, die vorliegt, ist sicher die, dass die Kraftsubstanz, mit der Paulus begabt ist, stärker ist als das Schlangengift." Cf. GRUNDMANN, TWNT, II, p. 311: "Lukas denkt, wie die Ag zeigt, dabei an Manabegabung, wie er auch die Christuskraft manaartig verstanden hat." Grundmann calls Ac. 28 : 3-6 the best commentary on Lk. 10 : 19. See further the depiction of mana in Ac. 5 : 15 and 19 : 11 ff. . . . ZORAB, *Magnetiseurs en Wondergenezers*, states that the mesmerist de Barbarin, who founded his celebrated "Harmonious Circle" at Ostend in 1795 and made his patients drink magnetized water, was convinced that "Jesus had also performed his miraculous healings through mesmerism, and he initiated his pupils in healing work by saying to them the following words: 'Try to do good, go forth and heal'" (p. 47).

thy name," Lk. 10 : 17. It is the "name of Jesus," i.e. Jesus Himself, that works the miracle. The apostles did not receive a superior, as it were paranormal gift, but they performed their signs and miracles so to speak from deed to deed in strict faithful obedience to the instructions of their Sender. Where this faith was absent, they were powerless; see Mt. 17 : 20 and parallel passages.¹

Even if someone was not a direct follower of Jesus, he could perform healings in His name.² The episode of the one who cast out devils is important in more than one respect. Firstly, we are struck by John's objection: the man had not been authorized to do so by Jesus! This proves that the disciples did receive "authorization."³ In the second place Jesus objects to the man being hampered in his work: "for there is no man which shall do a miracle in my name, that can lightly speak evil of me. For he that is not against us is on our part," Mk. 9 : 39, 40. This shows that Jesus sets other limits than John; He says: "We draw no lines; the vilifiers draw the lines."⁴ In this way the Kingdom remains open. In the third place the disciples receive the warning not to lapse into "haughty exclusivism."⁵ It is impossible to say what part superstition will have played with this man who cast out devils and his patients. The positive attitude which Jesus adopts with regard to him is, however, of far-reaching importance.

¹ OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 213 f.: "Die Übertragung der Vollmacht zu heilen an die ausgesandten Jünger (Mk. 3, 14 f.; 6, 7 par) durch Jesus hat nicht den Sinn, dass ihnen damit eine naturhafte, an ihrer Person klebende Gabe zu selbstherrlicher Verfügung überlassen werden sollte. Der Herr will sie vielmehr zu wirksamer Bezeugung der nahenden Gottesherrschaft durch Wort und Tat ausrüsten." Cf. BEYER, TWNT, III, p. 131: "nicht etwa eine Übertragung der Kraft von dem Meister auf die Jünger" takes place . . . CALVIN, Instit., III, II, 9, rightly points to the identity of power and faith in Paul, see 1 Co. 12 : 1-11.

² Mk. 9 : 38-40; Lk. 9 : 49, 50.

³ RENGSTORF, TWNT, I, p. 426, sees in this pericope evidence that the apostolate is present. Jesus' disciples have been given full powers. "Das ist jedenfalls die Meinung des Johannes, und sie wieder ist nur möglich, wenn für ihn die Wunderautorisation der zum Jüngerkreis Gehörigen kein Wunschbild, sondern im Jüngerkreis vorhandene und bisher auf ihn beschränkte, auf die Autorisation durch Jesus zurückgehende Wirklichkeit ist."

⁴ BERKELBACH VAN DER SPENKEL, Markus, p. 205.

⁵ KLOSTERMANN, Das Markusevangelium . . . OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 214: "Obwohl das Verhalten des 'fremden Exorzisten' Mk. 9, 38 ff. par, soweit es auf diesen selbst und seine Umgebung ankommt, in abergläubischem Namensgebrauch wurzelt, lässt Jesus ihn gewähren. Er will in seiner Antwort nicht den Aberglauben gutheissen, freilich auch nicht direkt gegen ihn polemisieren, sondern die Jünger mit der Duldsamkeit des wahrhaft Grossen aus ihrer selbstsüchtigen Enge herausführen."

3. *A comparison between the miracles of Jesus and those of the disciples* shows that in many respects there were similarities between both the syndromes and the methods of healing.¹ We do not have a single account of a "nature miracle" performed by the apostles. What Jesus did by His own power the disciples did in His power. According to CALVIN, here lies the "great distinction" between the miraculous deeds of Christ and those of His disciples.² Whilst maintaining this distinction we may say that the aim which the disciples had in mind when performing their miraculous works was none other than that of Jesus Himself, viz. that in Jesus Christ the Kingdom of God was nigh and that all miraculous deeds were functions of that Kingdom. When CALVIN says that Christ gave to His disciples "the insignia of heavenly power," so as "to provide them with belief and respect from the people,"³ he is right, but he has only indicated the secondary aspect. For the effect is secondary; the primary element is the break-through of the Kingdom of God "with force."

BLUMHARDT sees indispensable missionary means in the miracles of the apostles. According to Blumhardt, Christianity would never have become a world religion without these miracles.⁴ The miracles

¹ ARNOBIUS, *Adv. Gentes*, I, 50: "By the application of his hand he removed the marks of leprosy; they, too, restored to the body its natural skin by a touch not dissimilar. He ordered the dropsical and swollen flesh to recover its natural dryness; and his servants in the same manner stayed the wandering waters, and ordered them to glide through their own channels, avoiding injury to the frame" (transl. Archibald Hamilton Bryce).

² CALVIN, *Instit.*, I, XIII, 13. Calvin perceives in the miracles the divinity of Christ; the prophets and apostles also performed them, but a distinction should be noted: "in hoc tamen plurimum est discriminis, quod hi dona Dei suo ministerio dispensarunt: ille suam ipsius virtutem exeruit." Sometimes Jesus used prayer, but mostly He demonstrated His own power. "Usus est quidem interdum precatione, quo gloriam ad Patrem referret: sed videmus ut plurimum propriam eius virtutem nobis ostensam." The power of the apostles was the power of Christ. "Illi autem sic ministerio eiusmodi defuncti sunt, ut satis ostenderent virtutem non aliunde esse, quam a Christo." See also BRAUN, *TWNT*, VI, p. 482.

³ CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mt. 10 : 1: "Christus ergo edendis miraculis eos praeiciens, caelestis potentiae insignibus instruit, quae fidem ac reverentiam concilient apud populum."

⁴ BLUMHARDT, *Schriftauslegung*, p. 78 f.: "So setzte sich also die Wunderzeit nach Christus fort, vermittelt des heiligen Geistes . . . So kam es, dass die Apostel wirklich überall durch Zeichen und Wunder sich hervortaten; und nur dadurch konnten sie den überraschenden Eingang unter allerlei Völkern finden, den sie fanden. Ohnè Wunder, welche durch die Apostel und Jünger geschahen, wäre das Evangelium wohl gar nicht aufgekommen und zu einer Weltreligion geworden; oder wäre es in kurzer Zeit wieder vergessen gewesen, weil die Wunder Jesu selbst nicht, wie die Mosis, durch ihre Art oder Grossartigkeit vor dem Publikum, sondern durch die Predigt weltkundig werden konnten."

were in fact missionary means, but the propagandist force of the miracle should not be confused with its revelatory character. For the miracles of the apostles are no more "credentials" alone than are those of Jesus.

4. It will be appreciated that the miracles of the apostles were the centre of attention; *the Apocrypha yield abundant proof of this*. The various Apocryphal Acts are veritable receptacles for the most incredible events. Various healings are credited to Peter,¹ and also to John,² whilst Paul also received a generous share of them.³ Whilst in Acts not a single miracle involving animals occurs, the number of miracles of this kind in the Apocrypha is remarkably great.⁴ Such miracles are also attributed to Apollonius of Tyana and others.⁵

It is striking how often references are made to the power over snakes and scorpions. Jesus stressed the power of the disciples over these reptiles, Mk. 16 : 18, Lk. 10 : 19. The incident on Malta, Ac. 28 : 1-6, shows that Paul was immune to the bite of a viper. As a child Jesus was said to have cured His brother James of the bite of a

¹ Acta Petri (Actus Vercellenses) 20, healing of a blind widow; 25-29, various resurrections from the dead (HENNECKE, Neutestam. Apokr., p. 212 ff.) . . . In a Jewish Peter legend (Beth ha Midr. 5, 60; two versions exist) it is related how Peter caused his preaching in "the capital of the Christians," Rome, to be accompanied by signs, as Jesus had done: the healing of a leper and the resurrection of a dead person; see STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 530 ff. A survey of the miracles of the apostles in the Apocryphal Acts is given by SÖDER, Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten.

² Acta Joh. 106. John begins an address by drawing his audience's attention to the many powers which the Lord has bestowed upon him, and recalls the many miracles, healings and signs performed by him. Cf. Acta Joh. 19; 37; a mass healing in Ephesus; 46, 47; resurrection of a dead person, etc. (HENNECKE, p. 171 ff.).

³ Acta Pauli.

⁴ Acta Petri (Actus Vercellenses) 9 (talking dog); 13 (smoked fish revives). Acta Thom. 68 ff. (preaching ass). Acta Joh. 58-61 (obedient bugs). Acta Pauli 2, 28 (lioness licks Thekla's feet) . . . EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., III, XXXIX, 9 (Barsabas, surnamed Justus, see Ac. 1 : 23, drank a deadly poison without harming himself).

⁵ VITA APOLL., VI, 43. In Tarsus Apollonius made a vicious dog which had bit a boy return, and ordered it to lick the bite. The boy recovered . . . As regards this power over animals, see Jubilees 11 : 18-22. The fourteen-year-old Abraham protects sowing land against the ravens; at his command they no longer settle on the field . . . The story of a speaking tree occurs in Vita Apoll., VI, 10. One of the gymnosophists in Egypt, Thespesio, wanted to prove to Apollonius that they could work miracles. Pointing to a tree, he said: "let that tree address by name the learned Apollonius," "and the tree did name him as it was bidden, in a clearly articulated feminine voice."

viper.¹ The Talmud, too, contains a number of accounts of the power over snakes and scorpions. Noah was said to have been able to tread on these reptiles for twelve months in the Ark without coming to any harm, whilst Rabbi Hanina ben Dosa did not suffer any inconvenience from a snake-bite.² The followers of Dionysus were protected by this God against snakes.³ The power over snakes and scorpions did not simply mean mastery over these species of reptiles, but power over the demonic, victory over that creature most representative of Satan!⁴ For the serpent (Satan) is the reptile inimical

¹ THOMAS, *Paidika*, 16 (HENNECKE, p. 101): "Joseph sandte seinen Sohn Jakobus aus, Holz zusammenzubinden und nach Hause zu bringen, und auch das Knäblein ging mit ihm. Während nun Jakobus den Reisig sammelte, biss eine Natter in die Hand des Jakobus. Und als er hingestreckt und am Umkommen war, kam Jesus hinzu und blies auf den Biss, und sofort hörte der Schmerz auf, [und das Tier zerplatzte] und von Stund an blieb Jakobus gesund."

² Midr. psalm 91: "8. Thou shalt tread upon the serpent and asp (Ps. 91: 13). R. Levi taught: All the twelve months that Noah was in the ark he trod upon serpents and scorpions, and they did no harm to him, as it is said Thou shalt tread upon the serpent and asp. . . . because he hath set his love upon Me (Ps. 91: 14)" (ed. Braude). Berakoth 33a: "Our Rabbis taught: In a certain place there was once a lizard¹ which used to injure people. They came and told R. Hanina b. Dosa. He said to them: Show me its hole. They showed him its hole, and he put his heel over the hole, and the lizard came out and bit him, and it died. He put it on his shoulder and brought it to the Beth ha-Midrash and said to them: See, my sons, it is not the lizard that kills, it is sin that kills! On that occasion they said: Woe to the man whom a lizard meets, but woe to the lizard which R. Hanina b. Dosa meets!" (ed. Epstein; transl. M. Simon). Cf. FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 25. Fiebig compares the picking up of the lizard with Mk. 16: 18. But the picking up of *dead* snakes will not be meant in Mk. 16: 18! . . . BLAU, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, p. 72, says that the conjuration of snakes and scorpions was not unusual, see Tosephta Jebamoth, XIV, 4. . . The "name of Jesus," Jeshua ben Pantira, was one of the remedies of the Jews against snake-bite, see ETTREM, *Demonology*, p. 4, note 2.

³ EURIPIDES, *Bacchi*, 755 ff., see PREISKER, *Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 159: "Schlangen können ihnen nichts anhaben, keine Waffen kann sie verwunden, kein Feuer sie verbrennen" . . . BIELER, *op. cit.*, p. 108: "Pythagoras hat Schlangen vertrieben (Iambl. 142) und getötet (Apollon. Hist. mir. 6), Didymos (Rufin 24, 448A) auf Skorpione und Hornschlangen seinen Fuss gesetzt."

⁴ There is no creature that plays a more important part in the religious world of ideas of peoples than the snake. As a chthonian creature it is: "ein Teil der Erde" (KÜSTER). It seizes the souls of the dead (soul worm!); protects graves and treasures; is in communication with gnomes and heroes; knows both the corrupting and the healing forces of the earth, and acts as an avenger and a guardian. It possesses the gift of prophecy and other gifts which make it feared, etc. Its dualism, its positive and negative significance, finds expression in symbolism (amulets). See among others KÜSTER, *Die Schlange in der griechischen Kunst und Religion*; DUHM, *Die bösen Geister im A.T.*, p. 4 ff.; JIRKU, *Die Dämonen u. ihre Abwehr im A.T.*, p. 50 ff.; BODENHEIMER, *Animal and Man in Bible*

¹ Heb. Yarod, apparently a cross-breed of a snake and a lizard.

to God that seduced man, Gen. 3, but whose power was broken by the coming of Jesus Christ.¹ It is therefore understandable that in old Christian literature repeated references are made to this power of Jesus and His followers. JUSTIN quotes Jesus as having said: "I grant you the power to tread on serpents and scorpions and centipedes and on every force of the enemy." "And so," continues JUSTIN, "we who believe in our Lord Jesus, who was crucified in the time of Pontius Pilate, have now subjected to us as we banish them all the demons and evil spirits."² ORIGEN argues that the cripples who were healed through the power of Jesus received from Him the power "to 'tread' with the feet that were formerly lame on the 'serpents and scorpions' of evil, and simply on the whole power of the enemy, and whilst they tread they are not injured, for they too have become stronger than any evil and than the poison of the demons."³ This "poison of the demons" is an allusion to snake-poison. The connection between the victory of Jesus over the snake-Satan and the power of the faithful to tread on snakes and scorpions finds strong expression in these words of ORIGEN: "But if Jesus travels with you to paradise, then you will despise the serpent that has been overcome and crushed under the feet of Jesus, and through Him also under our feet, [of Jesus] who has given us the power to tread on serpents and scorpions and on every power of the enemy, so that not one of them shall injure you."⁴

Lands, pp. 64-68, Reptiles and Amphibians. "In the Bible the snake is described as subtle and cunning" (p. 65). For scorpions, see p. 75 f.; WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. 93. Gods in the form of snakes often had intercourse with women. Among others, Alexander the Great, Augustus and Scipio were held to be the sons of snakes. The deity Aesculapius was very closely connected with the snake. Weinreich points to the relation chthonian-phallic-averting disaster. Cf. HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 97, concerning miracle 44: a dumb girl is frightened by the sight of a snake and begins to cry out. The snake is an Aesculapian snake: "also für die Gläubigen das providentielle Werkzeug der Heilung." Textual material is offered by EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, p. 360 ff.; cf. II, p. 225 ff. КОТЪ, *Die Behandlung der Alten und Kranken bei den Naturvölkern*, p. 240: in Queensland there are tribes who believe that certain diseases are caused by the bite of an invisible snake. CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 14: according to an ancient Arab belief, in every snake there dwells a demon. PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 225 ff.

¹ The notion that the Redeemer treads the snakes under foot, see Gen. 3 : 15, Ps. 91 : 13, is depicted in Babylonian art. Cf. Christian art: in the porch of the Cathedral of Amiens Christ is shown standing on a lion and a dragon. See JEREMIAS, *Babylonisches im N.T.*, p. 94.

² JUSTIN, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 76.

³ ORIGEN, *c. Celsum*, II, 48.

⁴ ORIGEN, *Exhortatio ad Martyrium*, 36. Cf. *De Oratione*, 13.

TERTULLIAN devotes a fairly lengthy passage to this theme. "And of course we know," says TERTULLIAN, "that scorpions and vipers represent figuratively the spiritual 'beings' of evil, whose leader is also himself envisaged under the name of a serpent and a dragon and of any other most outstanding animal by the Creator, who first presented this power to his Christ, as the ninetyeth psalm says to him: 'Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under foot.'"¹

5. Not only in the Apocrypha, but also in *old Christian literature*, repeated references are made to the miraculous power of the disciples and those of the Christians of the first centuries after Christ. At the same time the effect of their deeds is often weighed against those of the pagan miracle-workers. For instance, JUSTIN writes: "For many of our people, namely of the Christians, have healed many throughout the whole world and also in your own capital who were possessed by demons and had not been healed by all the exorcists and sorcerers and mountebanks, by speaking the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, yea, and heal them even now, by calming and expelling the demons which reside in the people."² IRENAEUS states that the apostles were invested with the power of the Holy Ghost and received perfect knowledge after the Lord had risen from the dead. Then they went forth: "to the ends of the earth."³ Against the fraudulent tours de force of Simon and Carpocrates are set the deeds of the apostles; often the dead were roused by means of fasts and prayer.⁴ EUSEBIUS says

¹ TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 24: "Et utique scimus figurate scorpions et colubros portendi spiritalia malitiae, quorum ipse quoque princeps in serpentis et draconis et eminentissimae cuiusque bestiae nomine deputetur penes creatorem, largitum hanc potestatem priori Christo suo, sicut nonagesimus psalmus ad eum: Super aspidem et basilicum incedes, et conculeabis leonem et draconem."

² JUSTIN, *Apol.*, II, 6.

³ IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, III, 1, 1.

⁴ IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, II, 31, 2. Cf. II, 32, 4: "Therefore those who are truly his disciples, if they receive a gift of grace from him, also perform [miracles] to bestow benefactions on the rest of men, according as each received a gift from him. For some exclude demons most surely and in reality, so that very often those that are cleansed of the most evil spirits also believe in him and belong to the community. Others again even have foreknowledge of future things and sights and prophetic utterances. Further, others heal by laying their hands on those suffering from any infirmity, and restore them to health. And, as we have said (see II, 31, 2), there have already been those who have even risen from the dead, and have continued to live among us for many years." Cf. EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, V, VII.

that through the cooperation of heavenly power "the word of salvation suddenly illuminated the whole world like a sun-ray." Everywhere full churches were to be found, and those who had been ensnared in idolatry found liberation from their chains "through the power of Christ and the instruction and the miracles of his pupils."¹ Needless to say, when reading these accounts one asks oneself whether these wonderful things did in fact happen or not. And it is quite comprehensible that one shakes one's head in doubt. Yet many will hesitate to cast all these stories on the great heap of legends as mere propaganda. Though nobody will succeed in separating historical kernels from legendary shells, we do not believe that the "miracle" in the first centuries of the Christian era may simply be written off. The position is different with the Apocrypha. The unreliable nature of the miracle stories in these writings can, as it were, be tasted.²

6. We have now come to the problem that has engaged the minds of believers, and in particular Protestant believers, of every age. Was there a "*period of miracles*," and, if so, was there an *end to this period of miracles*, and where does the limit lie? Or is there no limit and do miracles still happen in the name and through the power of Jesus Christ? For Roman Catholicism there is no uncertainty: miracles still take place. Miracles regularly happen at Lourdes, says PAUWELS.³ In Protestantism, with its numerous differentiations,

¹ EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., II, III, 1-3 . . . For the wonderful self-sacrifice of the Christians during a plague epidemic, see VII, XXII . . . Miss EVELYN FROST, who offers considerable patristic material in her book *Christian Healing*, says: "The literature of the first three hundred years of the church's history is full of evidences of healing of various degrees of value. Some records are explicable by modern knowledge, some built over by legend and tradition until the original is almost lost, whilst on the other hand there remains the greater bulk of evidences, some direct, some indirect, showing that the healing work of Christ and the physical benefits of union with Him were part of the normal life of the members of His body" (p. 50).

² JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 121: "In den Evangelien haben wir das Wunder, das dazu dient, das Erbarmen und die Liebe des sein Reich gründenden Gottes zu offenbaren; in der apokryphen Literatur (man denke etwa an das Thomas-evangelium) das Wunder, das allein zur Verherrlichung des Wundertäters (des unreifen und geradezu bössartigen Jesusknaben) erzählt wird."

³ PAUWELS, *Het Wonder*, p. 113. Cf. the "Apologetiek" by the same author, p. 171 ff.: "Het constateren van Genezingswonderen." He makes the following significant comment: "Catholics are not obliged to believe that all healings performed by Saints or having happened at places of pilgrimage, as the result of touching relics, etc., are actual miracles, and certainly not that all these facts can be proved to be miracles; here too there is room for suggestion" (p. 174).

there are divergent opinions. CALVIN says in his polemic with the Roman Catholic Church's doctrine on extreme unction that the apostles healed some diseases, but that "this favour of healing was lost, as also the other wonders which the Lord was prepared to have happen for a time, to make the new proclamation of the gospel wonderful for eternity."¹ CALVIN nowhere specifies what he means by "a time," but his words indicate that this period did not last long. We find exactly the same view held by BAVINCK. "For a time this miraculous power continued to work among the faithful. But it ceased when Christianity was established and the Church had become the object in which God glorifies the wonders of his grace. It is spiritual miracles in which God now reveals his power and his glory."²

But what date must we give to the "establishment of Christianity?" About 100 A.D. or after Constantine's victory?³ KOHNSTAMM feels

LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle*, p. IX f.: "Ce n'est pas trop de dire que, du nord au midi, de l'orient à l'occident, la terre est tout entière parcourue et pour ainsi dire animée par l'esprit des prodiges, comme par un courant bienfaisant. Lourdes en France, Pompéi en Italie, la Guadeloupe au Mexique, Sainte-Anne de Beaupré au Canada, pour ne rien dire d'une multitude d'autres sanctuaires répartis sur la surface du globe, en rendent témoignage. Dans tous ces endroits, le merveilleux est devenu chose si commune, qu'il semble être plutôt la loi ordinaire qu'une exception . . ." Cf. p. 462, where Lépiciér praises the miracles of: "la très Sainte Mère de Jésus-Christ, la glorieuse Vierge Marie, la thaumaturge par excellence, proclamée avec tant de vérité par la bouche du peuple chrétien, Notre Dame des Miracles, Notre Dame des Prodiges." MONDEN, *Het Wonder*, p. 176 ff., who gives detailed literature on Lourdes. As regards the results, see p. 313, note 33. "Between 1858 and 1956 only 52 Lourdes healings were proclaimed as wonders by the Church; 13 of these date from the last ten years. However, between 1913 and 1946 no healings were canonically recognized as wonders."

¹ CALVIN, *Instit.*, IV, XIX, 18: "Caeterum evanuit gratia illa curationum, quemadmodum et reliqua miracula: quae ad tempus edi voluit Dominus, quo novam Evangelii praedicationem in aeternum admirabilem redderet."

² BAVINCK, *Geref. Dogmatiek*, I, p. 353. Cf. the view of BARTH, K.D., II, 2, p. 496 f. In view of Mt. 28 : 18 f. it must "probably" be said that the healing practice of the apostles continued in baptism. See the chapter: Relations involved in the Miracles of Jesus.

³ MAUTHNER, *Der Atheismus*, I, p. 30, says that some Protestant theologians date the end of the period of miracles at the dying-out of the apostles, others at the eradication of Arianism or at the conversion of Constantine. CAIRNS, *The Faith that Rebels*, p. 26: "Protestant Evangelical Christianity in the main would put the terminal period about the close of the New Testament age." Cairns expresses his agreement with the view held by Von Harnack that the miracles decrease on account of the compromise between Church and world. "It no longer possessed the strong, unconventional faith of the first generation." BARRETT, *St. John*, re Jn. 14 : 12: "The power to work miracles was universally credited to the apostles and their contemporaries (cf. for example 1 Cor. 12, 9 f.),

that he must oppose this traditional view of orthodox Protestant dogmatism. He wonders whether we must try to combat diseases, as Jesus did. He points to Blumhardt and Lourdes and then goes on to argue that following is not the same as imitating. "I will in no way deny that for present-day man, too, forces of a healing and saving nature can be achieved in the direction of 'wonderful' healing. I certainly believe that we must not regard the time of "miracles" as having come to an end once and for all with the days of the apostles, as traditional Protestantism often does."¹ BLUMHARDT, too, has pleaded vigorously for an open mind about miracles. He makes a distinction in Holy Writ between two great periods of revelation, viz. the first under Moses, the second under Jesus Christ. Now periods of revelation are also periods of miracles, i.e. God comes to man not only with words, but also with deeds. The difference between Moses' miracles and those of Christ is that Moses' person was not involved in them, whilst Jesus' was. Nowhere is it stated in the Bible that the miracles will cease. Doubtless miracles such as the answering of prayers and healings have occurred "in private," but after the apostolic period one can no longer speak of a "period of miracles." BLUMHARDT ascribes this to the disappearance of the personal Holy Ghost from the earth. A gradual decline occurred in the gift of the spirit and in the performance of miracles. BLUMHARDT says that he is "courageous enough" to expect a third period of revelation, which will reach its conclusion in the second coming of the Lord. In this third period many great miracles will again occur. BLUMHARDT points to his thirty years' struggle against the powers of darkness and to the remarkable healings in those years. This period of his life is to him an "example" of the great victory of Christ which is to come some day.²

and seems to have continued, especially as the power of exorcism, till a late date."

¹ KOHNSTAMM, Schepper en Schepping, III, p. 209. THURNEISEN, Die Lehre von der Seelsorge, says that, just as the prophetic and apostolic word takes its course in the community, so does the sign. "Wo immer aber das Heilungswunder geschieht, da geschieht es in einsamer Gewalt. Es stellt nicht nur im Gang des natürlichen Geschehens, sondern auch innerhalb des dem Glauben zugänglichen Handelns Gottes am Menschen etwas ganz Ausnahmsweises und göttlich Freies dar. Nicht alle Tage geschehen Wunder" (p. 231).

² BLUMHARDT, Schriftauslegung, chapter "Über die Wunder," pp. 67-116 . . . Blumhardt writes the following about the third period of revelation: "Solche plötzlich, wie über Nacht, eintretende Heilszeit—denn anders ist es nicht denkbar—stelle ich mir so bedeutend vor, dass ich sie eben darum eine dritte Offenbarungsepoche zu nennen geneigt bin, in welcher alle Kräfte des heiligen Geistes und

We have deliberately reproduced at some length the view and the vision of a man to whose heart the combination of word and miracle lies so near. To BLUMHARDT this is not just a historical or a dogmatical problem, but a problem of faith with which he wrestled. He could not accept the traditional view, because he could not conceive of the miracles of God decreasing or even ceasing.¹ If such words on prayer as are contained in Mt. 21 : 22 were to have applied only to the circle of the apostles, this would be more painful than consoling to us.²

It seems to us that to answer the question we must consider the double problem facing us. For we are concerned with two things: a "period of miracles" and a "time of miracles." As regards the period of miracles, we may say that "somewhere" in the historical development of Christianity the signs and miracles receded into the background as a regular aspect of and in the proclamation of the gospel. A terminus ad quem cannot be given, and we do not wish to make a guess at it. Having regard to the limitation, one can rightly speak of a "period of miracles" here. But this period is part of the "time of miracles," i.e. the time which has existed since the beginning of the world and will continue until its end. For it is simply absurd to try to draw a line somewhere in time, either in the past, or in the future—remember the view that all miracles will be capable of explanation "in the long run"—and to cry "here and no further" to the Will and the Power of God! Who would be prepared to say that God does no more miracles, even if they have not become public? The warning which Kohnstamm, Blumhardt and others address to those who cling to a traditional dogmatic view is therefore to the point and salutary. Indubitably this receptivity to miracles also entails dangers. It has often led to the wrong exegetic or spiritual turning being taken. Particularly in times of turmoil or of spiritual

demgemäss alle Wunder der Vorzeit, selbst nach Erfordernis die grossen mosaischen Wunder, kurz alles, was je Wunderbares geschah, wie in einer neuen Auflage wird wieder zu Tag kommen, weil Gott, der nicht will, dass jemand verloren gehe, Sein Äusserstes tun wird, um möglichst jedermann zur Busse zu bringen (2 Petr. 3, 9)" (p. 114 f.). Cf. in connection with this pronouncement that of LEWIS, *Miracles*: "God does not shake miracles into Nature at random as if from a pepper-caster. They come on great occasions: they are found at the great ganglions of history—not of political or social history, but of that spiritual history which cannot be fully known by men" (p. 201). See also SCHREUDER, *De overwinningsgedachte bij Johann Christoph Blumhardt*, p. 44 ff.; p. 124 ff.

¹ BLUMHARDT, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

² BLUMHARDT, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

revival it can be seen over and over again that there are those who wish to fall back on the miraculous forces from the apostolic period. In other words, the "period of miracles" is confused with the "time of miracles;" people close their eyes to historical facts and historical development. As an example, HOWARD COBB begins a work by saying that Christ healed all the sick who came to Him in faith or who were brought to Him by the faith of their friends, and that He must be ready and willing nowadays, too, to heal all the sick, otherwise He is not 'the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever'.¹ As a pronouncement of faith, this theory doubtless possesses great attraction and a spiritual value, but at the same time it is evidence of a lack of historical insight, since the factuality of the period of miracles is simply ignored. Elsewhere we shall deal at greater length with the problem of spiritual healing and faith healing and the manifestation of spiritual powers.²

In this respect the problem of miracles will always remain a topical one, and there are numerous factors which determine each believer's personal view of it.

¹ HOWARD COBB, *Christus de geneesheer*, p. 11.

² See the chapter: Relations involved in the Miracles of Jesus.

II FUNCTION AND SIGNIFICANCE OF MIRACLES IN JESUS' ACTIVITIES

When investigating the function and the significance of miracles in Jesus' activities we find ourselves confronted with various relations and aspects which we shall consider in the form outlined below.

- (a) Jesus' conduct as miracle-worker.
 - 1. The Messianic aspect.
 - 2. The prophetic aspect.
 - 3. The priestly aspect.
- (b) Function and significance of Jesus' miracles.
 - 1. Miracles as proof of identity.
 - 2. Miracles as a display of mercy.
 - 3. Miracles as a means of arousing faith.
 - 4. Miracles as a sign.
- (c) Miracles as a function of the Kingdom of God.

(a) JESUS' CONDUCT AS MIRACLE-WORKER

Elsewhere we described miracles as a special form of revelation in which the Power of God is manifested in a new reality. The Power of God reveals itself not only in the order of creation as and insofar as this presents itself to man and can be recognized by him in its behaviour, but also in the history of mankind. In this history the story of Israel forms exceptional testimony to the energetic leadership of God, which manifested itself in many a wonderful way, see for instance Deu. 3 : 24, Psalms 78. In this respect a continuity can be seen between the revelatory character of the Old Testament and that of the New Testament. Everywhere in the Old Testament where people are strikingly involved in sacred history, we find the traces of the mirabile and the miraculum. They are to be seen in theophanies and visions, in symbolic acts and miraculous deeds. Remember the wonderful aspects of the lives of Abraham,¹ Isaac,² and Jacob.³ The life of Moses is characterized

¹ See for instance Gen. 15, promise of an heir and sign of the covenant; Gen. 16, appearance of an angel to Hagar; Gen. 18, appearance of three men; Gen. 22, etc.

² Gen. 26 : 1-6; God's appearance to Isaac. Cf. verse 24.

³ Gen. 28 : 10-22, dream at Bethel; Gen. 32 : 1, 2, the appearance of angels; Gen. 32 : 22-32, the wrestling at night in Peniel.

by a series of theophanies and miraculous feats.¹ And remember Joshua,² Gideon,³ Samson,⁴ Samuel⁵ and others,⁶ whilst a great number of miracles are attributed to Elijah and Elisha.⁷

We also find the traits of the mirabile in the written remains of the prophets.⁸ We see again and again how God, through the words and deeds of leaders and prophets called for that purpose, made known His will and power. Through those He summoned the past was recalled to the minds of the people and kept alive, the present was judged and the future was foretold. And God revealed His freedom, power and love by intervening not only in the lives of the people and of individuals but also in natural processes.

It is against this background of God's acts of redemption and judgment, as regards both His people and the peoples of the world, that the whole of Jesus' work must be viewed. GRUNDMANN has given an excellent outline of the "Power of God" in the Old and New Testaments. The power of Christ is the Power of God.⁹ Before

¹ It is unnecessary to give references to Scripture. The whole life of Moses was one of mirabile and miraculum, see Deu. 34 : 10-12.

² Jos. 3 and 4, the crossing of Jordan; Jos. 5 : 13-15, appearance of an angel; Jos. 6, the fall of Jericho; Jos. 10 : 10-14, great stones are cast down from heaven and the sun and the moon stand still.

³ Judg. 6 : 11-24, appearance of an angel to Gideon; Judg. 6 : 36-40, sign with a fleece of wool; see also Judg. 2 : 1-5, appearance of an angel at Bochim.

⁴ Judg. 13 : 2 ff., Samson's birth; Judg. 13 : 25: "the spirit of the Lord began to move him" . . . The feats of Samson . . . Judg. 15 : 18, 19, the spring at Lehi.

⁵ 1 Sa. 3, Samuel's call; 1 Sa. 7, defeat of the Philistines; 1 Sa. 9 : 6, all that Samuel says "cometh surely to pass," etc. See also 1 Sa. 5, 6: the ark in the country of the Philistines; 2 Sa. 6 : 6, 7, Uzzah's death.

⁶ See 2 Sa. 24 : 10-17, the seer Gad prophesies God's punishment to David. 1 Ki. 13 : 1-10, the miraculous sign of the man of God at Bethel. 1 Ki. 13 : 11-32, God's judgment on this man of God. 1 Ki. 14 : 1-18, death of Abijah, the son of Jeroboam, foretold by the prophet Ahijah. 2 Ch. 26 : 16-21, Uzziah afflicted with leprosy.

⁷ 1 Ki. 17 ff.; 2 Ki. 1-13.

⁸ See Jonah; Isa. 37 : 6, 7, 33-37, defeat of Sennacherib; Isa. 38 : 1-8, healing of Hezekiah. Sign of the sun dial . . . Jer. 28 : 15-17, death of the lying prophet Hananiah prophesied by Jeremiah . . . The mirabile in the life of Daniel . . . We shall refrain from a critical discussion of the miracle stories in the O.T. All these accounts are concerned with the revelation of the power of God in a salutary or punitive sense.

⁹ GRUNDMANN, TWNT, II, p. 306 f. : "Christuskraft ist Gotteskraft. Dabei handelt es sich um das Ausziehen einer Linie, wie sie im AT in der königlich-messianischen und prophetischen Kraft vorhanden war. In einzigartiger Weise ist Jesus als der Christus der Träger der Gotteskraft . . . Die Christuskraft wird wirksam in der Geschichte, und zwar als eschatologisches Geschehen in der Geschichte. Damit ist im NT in einzigartiger Weise die atliche Vorstellung von der in der Geschichte wirksamen, die Geschichte gestaltenden und ihr ein

this power Satan and his henchmen fled; by this power the sick were healed and the elements subdued. It operated in and through Jesus, but also in those whom He blessed therewith, for it was He whose coming was promised to Israel: the Redeemer.

We can distinguish three aspects of Jesus' conduct as a miracle-worker, the first being:

1. *The Messianic aspect*

Jesus acted as the Messiah. Here we find the link with Israel's expectation of salvation. Although the picture which the Old Testament and Jewish literature give of the Messiah does not display a constant character, there are nevertheless two traits which repeatedly come to the fore, viz. that of the political, national redeemer and that of the spiritual saviour. The Messiah will reveal Himself as King and as Saviour. Jesus did not fulfil the political expectation; His Kingdom is not of this world.¹ Jesus came as the God-given Saviour who was concerned with the salvation of every human being in his totality. He knew that He was the Messiah and that He, as the Son, had received authority and power from the Father. He bore witness to this when speaking to the disciples of John the Baptist, Mt. 11 : 2-6,

Ziel gebenden Kraft Gottes wieder aufgenommen." GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 73 ff. The deliverance from Egypt has its pendant in the deliverance from the power of Satan by Jesus Christ. In both the power of God is revealed (p. 77). Cf. H. W. WOLFF, *Herrschaft Jahwes u. Messiasgestalt im Alten Testament* (ZAW, Band 13, Heft 3/4, 1936), p. 169. God delivered His people from Egypt. In this is revealed: "das Herrentum Jahwes." In the Messiah Yahweh is manifest as: "der Jenseitige, vor allem aber als der Geschichtsmächtige" (p. 201).

¹ See among others PICKL, *Messias König Jesus*, and cf. also GRESSMANN, *Der Messias*; see also VAN DER LOOS, *Jezus Messias-Koning*. VOLZ, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde*, p. 173 ff., "Der Messias-König." To the rabbis the Messiah is: "nicht mit deutlichen Funktionen ausgestaltet." The aeon of salvation as such was longed for. "Der Messias ist politischer und geistiger Führer des Volkes" (p. 176). CULLMANN, *Die Christologie des N.T.*, p. 111 ff., *Jesus der Messias . . .* H. RIESENFELD, *The Mythological Background of New Testament Christology* (contribution to: *The Background of the N.T. and its Eschatology*, in honour of C. H. Dodd, p. 90), has commented that Jesus Christ is the centre of all Christology. He Himself "created Christology in its very kernel." A study of the text shows that Jesus regarded Himself as the Messiah. Otherwise the description of Jesus in the Gospels is inexplicable . . . E. STAUFFER, *Messias oder Menschensohn*, however, believes that Jesus rejected both the political Messiah concept of Jewish resistance and the "entpolitisierte" Messiah concept of the "pious of the land." "Darum hat Jesus sich nicht als den Messias bezeichnet, sondern als den Menschensohn. Den höchsten und reinsten Ausdruck aber fand der metaphysische Geltungsanspruch Jesu in der geheimnisvollen Theophanieformel ANI HU" (p. 102).

and in His address in the synagogue at Nazareth, Lk. 4 : 16-30.¹ He "fulfilled" the prophecy of Isaiah, Lk. 4 : 21, i.e. His coming meant that the Messianic era had dawned.

The old Christian authors, in their apologies written against the opponents of the Christian faith and the propagators of various heresies, never tire of arguing that everything concerning the Christ had been foretold, and that the prophecies had been entirely fulfilled.²

Jesus' Messiahship functioned both in His preaching and in His miracles, i.e. it displayed its force in history, concretely, among men and to men. It is therefore quite incorrect to try and deny Jesus' miracles their Messianic nature.³

¹ GOPPELT, *Typos*, p. 80: "Jesus klammert sich, das zeigen beide Stellen (Mt. 11 und Lukas 4), nicht mechanisch-äusserlich an eine willkürlich ausgewählte Vorhersage, sondern verweist in freier Anlehnung an atl Stellen darauf, dass in seinem Werk Erwartungen, die das ganze AT durchziehen, erfüllt sind: Die Vollendung der vorläufigen und vorbildlichen Heilswirksamkeit ist da!" STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 593: "In der messian. Heilszeit erwartete man Heilung aller Krankheiten." Cf. also IV, p. 799 ff.

² JUSTIN, *Apol.* 31: "Now in the books of the prophets we find it foretold that Jesus, our Christ, would come into the world, would be born of a virgin, would attain manhood, would heal all diseases and ills and would raise the dead, that he would be hated, misunderstood and crucified, that he would die and rise and ascend to heaven . . . And that was foretold 5000, 3000, 2000, 1000 and 800 years before his birth. For every generation had its new prophets." Cf. also cap. 48. . . IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, IV, 33, 11. The prophets "announced the healings which he would perform" (. . . eas quae ab eo curationes fiebant annuntiaverunt). ORIGEN, *c. Celsum*, I, 50. Many prophets have prophesied about Christ in all kinds of ways. TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 8: "He therefore is the Christ of Isaiah, the restorer of the sick;" cf. IV, 9, 10 and *passim* . . . Cf. also RUPPRECHT, *Das Wunder in der Bibel*, p. 135 ff., on "Erfüllte Weissagungen." Rupprecht gives considerable textual material, which, however, must be viewed critically! KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 267 ff. Klausner divides Jesus' miracles into five categories, the first being: "Miracles due to a wish to fulfil some statement in the Old Testament or to imitate some Prophet." Jesus had to perform healing miracles: "For he taught the people that 'the Kingdom of heaven is at hand,' and the 'signs of the Messiah' must, therefore, come upon the earth and be seen of men."

³ WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, p. (4): Jesus' miracles are not those of the Messiah and offer no proof of His Messiahship. Cf. Second Discourse, p. (2). SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 415: the miracles have nothing to do with Jesus' Messiahship. Cf. p. 294 f. FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 72: the Jewish miracle stories demonstrate: "dass es falsch ist, die Wunder Jesu allein oder vorzugsweise aus seiner Messianität abzuleiten. Gewiss erwarteten die Juden der Zeit Jesu vom Messias Wunder, aber sie sagten sie doch auch von ihren Rabbinen aus, ohne dabei an Messianisches zu denken. So liegt denn auch im N.T. z. B. bei der Stillung des Sturmes der Gedanke an den Messias nicht unmittelbar nahe, ebensowenig bei der Speisungsgeschichte." SCHLATTER, *Das Wunder in der Synagoge*, p. 83, refers to the Messianic nature of the miracles.

2. *The prophetic aspect*

The Gospels repeatedly state that Jesus was a prophet or *the* Prophet. Jesus said this of Himself, both directly and indirectly.¹ Others have frequently affirmed it with reference to His teaching and His miracles.² As in the Messianic aspect, the link with the Old Testament is clearly visible here. From the beginning of the existence

The Gospels recount the miracles: "weil sie Jesus als den Christus verkünden. Seine Handlungen beruhen auf seiner Sendung, auf seinem königlichen Recht, auf seiner Sohnschaft Gottes." FRÖVIG, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu als Lehrer und Wundertäter*, p. 209. The teaching and the miraculous feats of Jesus are "Messianic." BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 291: "Jesus ist als der Gesalbte der Prophet und der Messias zugleich, und er erfüllt zuerst die Weissagungen, die von dem Propheten wie Moses gelten, ehe er als König in Herrlichkeit kommt."

¹ Directly: Lk. 13 : 33. GILS, *Jésus Prophète*, p. 47, re Mt. 13 : 57 and Lk. 13 : 33. Why did Jesus choose such miracles as those of the old prophets? "Nous pouvons bien soupçonner qu'il agit de la sorte parce qu'il a conscience d'une certaine affinité avec les prophètes thaumaturges." Cf. p. 28 re Lk. 13 : 33. Indirectly: Mt. 13 : 57; Mk. 6 : 4; Lk. 4 : 24; Jn. 4 : 44.

² Mt. 21 : 11, 46; Mk. 6 : 15; Lk. 9 : 8; 7 : 16; Mt. 16 : 14; Mk. 8 : 28; Lk. 9 : 19; Jn. 6 : 14; 4 : 19; 7 : 40; 9 : 17. Cf. also Lk. 7 : 39; 24 : 19; Jn. 1 : 21 (the question put to John); 1 : 25; 7 : 52; Ac. 3 : 22, 23; 7 : 37. GILS, *Jésus Prophète*, p. 163: "Les foules qui avaient entendu et suivi Jésus, comme d'instinct, avaient reconnu en lui un prophète. Nous pouvons être assurés que le portrait du Christ prophète est un legs de la tradition orale primitive." MEYER, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa*, is also of the opinion that the foundation of the picture of the prophetic Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels is "offenbar ältester Jüngerglaube" (Vorwort, cf. p. 120). Meyer makes a distinction between four aspects of the picture of the prophetic Jesus, viz. that of a prophet, of the Messianic prophet, of Elijah and of the resurrected John . . . The later Jewish literature several times speaks of a prophet who will act as redeemer. Deu. 18 : 15-18 was doubtless of influence here. See 1 Macc. 4 : 44-46; 14 : 41; Testament of Levi 8 : 15; Assumption of Moses 11 : 16 . . . In Flavius Josephus, *Antiq.*, XX, 5, 1, it is stated that Theudas said of himself that he was a prophet. The Egyptian asserted the same thing, see *Antiq.*, XX, 8, 6. Here the "prophet" wanted to play the part of the political liberator. "Daraus erkennt man," according to STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 480, "wie eng im Denken des Volkes in den letzten Jahrzehnten vor der Zerstörung Jerusalems die Vorstellungen vom 'Propheten, der da kommen soll' und vom Erlöser-Messias zusammengehörten." This is also evident from Jn. 6 : 14 ff. . . . Likewise starting from Deu. 18 : 15-18 the Samaritans expected the Ta'eb or Shaheb, the "Wiederhersteller," a Moses redivivus. This Ta'eb will give his people national freedom and rule over eleven nations, but all this will be without the use of arms. Ta'eb will reunite the Jews and the Samaritans and bring the Jews under the Samaritan religion. He will die at the age of 120. The Ta'eb period is a preliminary period, after which the Day of Judgment will take place. See VOLZ, *Die Eschatologie der jüd. Gemeinde*, p. 200; cf. p. 193. See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 479 f. and p. 626 f. on Deu. 18 : 15-18 in rabbinical literature . . . CULLMANN, *Die Christologie des N.T.*, p. 11 ff., Jesus der Prophet. Cullmann tries to bear in mind the distinction between Jesus as "ein Prophet" (e.g. Lk. 7 : 16) and as "der endzeitliche Prophet" (e.g. Mk. 6 : 14) (p. 29 ff.).

of Israel as a nation a series of prophets played an influential role in sacred history. ¹ The prophet functioned as the organ of revelation of the God of Israel; he spoke for Him, Ex. 7 : 1, 2. The Spirit of the Lord made another man of the prophet, 1 Sa. 10 : 6. As the organ of revelation of God, the prophet was able to perform miracles and signs, as is explicitly stated of Moses, for instance. ² It therefore goes without saying that the people regarded Jesus as a prophet, for in the person of the prophet God looked after His people. ³

A comparison between the miracles of the prophets and those of Jesus shows that, despite many similarities, there are nevertheless fundamental differences. The prophets did not heal any blind or paralysed persons. PERELS points out that from the miracles of Elijah and Elisha, for example, the word spoken with power is absent. ⁴ However, the essential difference comes clearly to the fore

As regards the notions of the sect of Qumran concerning the "prophet", see VAN DER WOUDE, *Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumrân*, p. 75 ff. For the Ta'eb, see p. 81 ff.

¹ For instance Abraham, Gen. 20 : 7; Aaron, Ex. 7 : 1; Moses, Deu. 34 : 10; Gideon, Judg. 8 : 6; Samuel; Gad, 1 Sa. 22 : 5; Nathan, 2 Sa. 7 : 2; Ahijah, 1 Ki. 11 : 29; the prophetess Huldah, 2 Ki. 22 : 14; Elijah; Elisha.

² Deu. 34 : 10-12: "And there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom the Lord knew face to face, In all the signs and the wonders which the Lord sent him to do in the land of Egypt to Pharaoh, and to all his servants, and to all his land, And in all that mighty hand, and in all the great terror which Moses shewed in the sight of all Israel."

³ See Lk. 7 : 16. FRÖVIG, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*, p. 103: "Es steht also fest, dass wir in den Perikopen Mk. 6, 5 f., 8, 27 f. ursprüngliche und zuverlässige Traditionen haben, und dass deshalb Jesus vom gewöhnlichen Mann als Prophet aufgefasst und Prophet genannt worden ist." FASCHER, ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ, p. 178, thinks that the mighty prophet was promoted to Messiah. "Formgeschichtlich betrachtet liegt die Sache so, dass in einer bestimmten Traditionsschicht der synoptischen Überlieferung Jesus nicht als Gottessohn und Messias, sondern als 'προφήτης' betrachtet wird." A disputable proposition! At the same time Fascher points to the Johannine figure of Jesus as prophet; He knows everything, performs great miracles and is the bringer of gnosis. This figure differs fundamentally from the Old Testament one; Jesus makes man's salvation dependent on the tie with His person, as Simon, Marcus and Alexander do (p. 208) . . . Cf. also HEMPEL, *Heilung als Symbol u. Wirklichkeit im bibl. Schrifttum*, p. 294 ff. FRIEDRICH, TWNT, VI, p. 842 ff.

⁴ Cf. 1 Ki. 17 : 10-16; 17-24; 2 Ki. 4 : 1-7; 8-17; 18-37; 42-44; 5 : 1-14. "Alle diese Wunder stehen in deutlichen Abstand von dem grössten Teil der synoptischen. Denn ihnen allen fehlt das sofort wirksame Machtwort. Darum ist auch die auf einen Höhepunkt zulaufende Gestaltung nicht vorhanden," according to PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 77 . . . In 2 Ki. 1 : 9-18 the word spoken with power occurs in a punitive miracle . . . MEYER, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa*, p. 25, cf. p. 31, draws attention to the fact that no politico-military miracles are reported as having been performed by Jesus such as are attributed

in Peter's avowal. Jesus is not "one of the prophets" but "Christ, the Son of the living God," Mt. 16 : 16. On the strength of this avowal he is pronounced "blessed."

In this connection FRÖVIG mentions the "superprophetic self-awareness" of Jesus.¹ Jesus says of Himself that He is "greater than Jonas" and "greater than Solomon," Mt. 12 : 41 ff. and parallel passage.

We may therefore say that in this aspect of prophet/miracle-worker, too, Jesus revealed Himself as the One promised by the Lord, Isa. 11 : 1-5.²

3. *The priestly aspect*

The Gospels speak on several occasions of how Jesus was moved by and took pity on the multitude³ and individuals.⁴ A number of

to Moses and Joshua. With the exception of Jn. 6 : 14 f., which seems to recall the time in the wilderness.

¹ FRÖVIG, *op. cit.*, p. 179: "überprophetisches Selbstbewusstsein"; cf. p. 103 ff. MEYER, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa*, also points to the prophetic self-awareness of Jesus and His prophetic consciousness of His mission. And yet the prophetic picture of Jesus as the Synoptists have handed it down to us insufficiently reproduces Jesus' person and work. "Dies ist ein deutliches Zeichen dafür, dass Jesus letztlich eigenständig und schöpferisch gewirkt hat" (p. 131). Cf. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, p. 38 ff. ALBERTZ, *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche*, p. 164, comes to the conclusion that in the disputes Jesus proves Himself to be the: "Fortsetzer der grossen Propheten." He fights the rabbis with their own methods. "In überraschender Selbstsicherheit schlägt sie Jesus auf ihrem eigenen Gebiet, ein Prophet, aber mit überprophetischem Sendungsbewusstsein." SCHLINGENSIEPEN, *Die Wunder des N.T.*, p. 149, points out that for instance Origen, Eusebius, Cyril, etc., concern themselves with comparing the miracles of the Old Testament and those of the New Testament, declaring that those of Jesus are superior to those of the Old Testament. In his *Demonstratio evangelica* Eusebius compares the feats of Moses and those of Jesus down to the tiniest details . . . KRONER, *The Religious Function of Imagination*, p. 56 f., points out that the prophet in the Old Testament is the son of his people and the messenger of God. "Jesus is no longer a prophet, i.e. a national missionary of God. He has to announce a new covenant between God and man without the mediation of a definite nation as chosen by God. He therefore can no longer perform his task as the son of his people, but as the 'Son of man', and as such the immediate 'Son of God.' This peculiarity is the uniqueness of Jesus; through it he is the Christ."

² Cf. BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 51 ff. Bornhäuser stresses that Jesus was "the prophet," who performed miracles as no-one had ever done. He refers to Isaiah 40-66 and says of Jesus: "er ist der gesalbte Prophet" (p. 61). MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 339. In Jesus "a new prophet" appeared. "This at once invests his mission with a divine authority in the eyes of the people generally, if not of their religious leaders." Cf. BRUNNER, *Der Mittler*, p. 381: "Jesus ist nicht wie die Propheten bloss Verkünder des kommenden Gottesreiches. Er ist es, der wagt, wenn auch immer in bewusster Verhüllung, vom *Gekommensein* des Reiches zu reden." The transcendental Kingdom of God, the miraculous, came in His person, hence the signs.

³ Mt. 9 : 36; Mt. 14 : 14; Mt. 15 : 32; Mk. 6 : 34; Mk. 8 : 2.

⁴ Mt. 20 : 34; Mk. 1 : 41; Lk. 7 : 13.

outsiders appealed to Jesus' compassion.¹ One can therefore speak here of the priestly aspect of Jesus' activities. But this does not mean that Jesus in any way assumed the function of the priest. For He sends healed lepers to the priests to have themselves pronounced clean.² And therefore when we speak here of a priestly aspect, we do so within the framework of the *munus triplex*, the threefold office of Christ. The priestly aspect finds expression in the emotion, the love, the devotion to others, which reached its climax in Jesus' death on the cross.³

The subdivision into three aspects in no way implies that the one action of Jesus as miracle-worker should be divided into three separate functions. It is the one function of which a certain aspect strikes us the most, depending on the function's motives and activity. KORFF has rightly remarked that the three "offices" of Christ are not simply alongside each other, but in each other.⁴ This view is of fundamental importance to the interpretation of the function and significance of Jesus' miracles.

(b) FUNCTION AND SIGNIFICANCE OF JESUS' MIRACLES

Various exegetes allow themselves to be guided in their investigation into the motives and the object of Jesus' miracles by a dogmatic

¹ Mk. 7 : 32; Mk. 8 : 22; Mk. 9 : 22.

² Mt. 8 : 1-4; Lk. 17 : 14 . . . DE JONG, *Demonische Ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel*, draws attention to "the extremely negative attitude of the priest-physician." The latter had the diagnosing of leprosy at his fingertips, but he did not think of giving treatment. "The Biblical priest established uncleanness and did nothing. This refusal of medical aid by the priests was so striking that it is later recounted as a characteristic attitude." De Jong refers to Lk. 10 : 31 and the attitude of the Pharisees in Jn. 9 : 13-34. In such a climate medicine cannot flourish and "miraculous" medicine is fostered, according to De Jong (p. 92 f.). Cf. HEMPEL, *Heilung als Symbol u. Wirklichkeit im bibl. Schrifttum*, p. 293 ff.

³ NOORDMANS, *Herscheping*, p. 133: "We see the reconciliation and the forgiveness repeatedly come to the fore in Jesus' association with the sinners, in his parables and miracles." Cf. K. BARTH, K.D., IV, 1, p. 302 ff. The work of Jesus Christ is the essence and the fulfilment and at the same time the abolition of all human priestly work. The principal function of the priest is to make the sacrifice. Jesus is sacrificer and sacrifice in one. "Im Werk Jesu Christi und in ihm allein geschieht das wirkliche, das genügende Priesterwerk, das *sacra dare*" (p. 304).

⁴ KORFF, *Christologie*, II, p. 212: "The trilogy of revelation, dominion and redemption corresponds to that other trilogy: prophetic, royal, priestly office. These offices prove not merely to stand side by side, but rather in one another" . . . EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, I, III, 8, already speaks of Jesus Christ as "the true anointed, the divine and heavenly Word, who is the sole high priest of everything and the sole king of entire creation and the sole archprophet of the prophets." Cf. GILS, *Jésus Prophète*, p. 1 . . . See further BERKOUWER, *Het werk van Christus*, pp. 59-92, Ch. IV, *Het ambt van Christus*.

or psychological preference for one or more of the aspects mentioned above. As a result, the unity suffers. The following points summarize the principal ways of thinking.

1. *Miracles as proof of identity*

Even in the early Church we encounter the view that the miracles had to form the proof of Jesus Christ's divinity. They were the credentials which the Father had given the Son. A clear example of this is offered by ORIGEN when he compares the miracles of Jesus with those of Moses. Moses performed miracles and signs so that he "would be believed not only by the elders, but also by the people. Why, therefore, should not Jesus, so that he should be believed by those of the people who had learned to demand signs and miracles, have had need of such powers," which were greater and "more divine" than those of Moses?¹ SCHLINGENSIEPEN points out that the early Church was seeking a complete proof of the omnipotence of the Son of God, a kind of philosophical absolutism.²

We also encounter the idea of proof of identity in THOMAS AQUINAS when he says that "the miracles were performed by Christ to confirm his doctrine and to prove his divine power."³ We repeatedly encounter this view in both Roman Catholic and Protestant theologians; the latter can in this respect invoke CALVIN's positive pronouncement: "For we know that Christ did not perform his miracles as a game, but with the object of proving by them that he was the Son of God, given to the world as a Redeemer."⁴ A noteworthy point is that the English philosopher Locke regarded the miracles as credentials which God had given to His messenger. The miracle is the basis on which Christ's divine mission is founded.⁵ We may refer for more

¹ ORIGEN, c. Celsum, II, 52; cf. II, 48.

² SCHLINGENSIEPEN, op. cit., p. 150.

³ THOMAS AQUINAS, Summa Theologiae, III, qu. XLIII, art. III: "Respondeo dicendum, quod miracula facta sunt a Christo propter confirmationem doctrinae eius, et ad ostendendum virtutem divinam in ipso." Cf. III, qu. XLIII, art. IV. Cf. LÉPICIER, Le Miracle. Lépicier, who repeatedly invokes Thomas, says that the miracles happen for the purpose: "de confirmer la vérité enseignée, ainsi que de manifester, au moins ordinairement, la présence de la divinité dans celui qui en est l'auteur" (p. 474).

⁴ CALVIN, Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas, re Mt. 12 : 16: "Scimus enim Christum non lusisse in miraculis, sed hunc habuisse propositum finem ut se Dei Filium probaret, ac datum mundo Redemptorem." Cf. Instit., I, XIII, 13.

⁵ TENNANT, Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions, p. 80 f.: "As a representative of the common-sense orthodoxy that survives to-day as an inheritance from the remote past, perhaps none better could be found than Locke.

recent times to RICHARDSON and FRÖVIG, who, whilst being alive to the element of mercy, wish to stress the proof of identity aspect.¹

This stereotyped view has been attacked from various quarters. WOOLSTON was already opposed to the use normally made of the miracle stories to prove Jesus' authority and Messiahship.² However, WOOLSTON himself used every possible means to render his allegorical interpretation of the miracles plausible.

A truly serious opposition is to be found in CAIRNS. He vigorously resists the view that sees in the miracles only the "evidential portents of mere Divine Power." No, says CAIRNS, the deeds of Jesus are "parts of the document itself."³ Christ is no "heavenly bellman," but the Son, whose heart goes out to mankind. He works miracles "because He cannot help working them, out of the sheer creative faith and hope and love within Him, which bring God in His healing power and man in his suffering and sorrow together."⁴ KOHNSTAMM associates himself closely with Cairns. The miracles are not credentials.

This eminently 'reasonable' yet deeply pious Christian philosopher regarded miracles as credentials given by God to His messenger, so that we, through testimony, are able to know that Christ's revelation is God's. He was fond of quoting 'no man can do these signs . . . except God be with him.' Miracle, he teaches, is the basis on which Christ's divine mission is always established; and consequently the foundation on which believers in any divine revelation must ultimately bottom their faith. This was later the position of Paley, and again of Mozley: and it represents an attitude still common in minds not wholly unaffected by awareness of New Testament criticism."

¹ RICHARDSON, *The Miracle-stories of the Gospels*, p. 31. In the Synoptic Gospels and in the Gospel of John the miracles are "evidence (not to the general public, but only to those who have eyes to see) as to Who Jesus is. This, we shall maintain, is their *raison d'être* in all four Gospels." The miracles are not recounted first and foremost "in order to illustrate the compassion of Jesus" (p. 32). FRÖVIG, *op. cit.*, p. 96. The miracles serve: "zur Bestätigung der Verkündigung und Beweise seiner Sendung. Weil sie Hilfe schenkten, standen sie als Beweise der Güte und Gnade Gottes. Sie waren aber auch Beweise dafür, dass Jesus von oben her gesandt war" (Cf. Ex. 4; Deu. 13 : 1-5). According to the Roman Catholic author FILLION, *op. cit.*, I, p. 3, it is Jesus' miracles: "qui fournissent des lettres de créance indiscutables." Cf. p. 149. The miracles are also works of mercy, but this purpose is secondary (p. 164). The French Jewish scholar SALVADOR says in his "Jésus-Christ et sa Doctrine," II, p. 974: "Jésus, dans les Évangiles, opère ses miracles pour se manifester lui-même, pour attester sa nature céleste . . ."

² WOOLSTON, *op. cit.*, Second Discourse, p. (2). The proof of identity has only been contrived "for the Honour of the Holy Jesus."

³ CAIRNS, *The Faith that Rebels*, p. 70. The traditional view sees Jesus' miracles as "evidential portents of mere Divine Power." This is wrong. "Such portents elsewhere are explicitly refused by Jesus." We encounter the same view as that held by Cairns in HUNTER, *The Words and Work of Jesus*, p. 55.

⁴ CAIRNS, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

"Jesus certainly does not do miracles to create believers or to attract attention. That is most inconsistent with his whole being. He aids and heals as a poet writes poetry, because his poems are the expression of his being." The miracles form part of the 'life of Jesus,' as Cairns has rightly remarked.¹

Many others, for instance WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT,² MACK-INNON,³ F. BARTH,⁴ SCHNIEWIND,⁵ and RENGSTORF,⁶ object to the traditional view because other important elements are neglected thereby.

2. *Miracles as a display of mercy*

Many investigators believe that the deepest motive that prompted Jesus to perform His miracles is to be found in His compassion. This does not mean that they are not alive to Jesus' display of power, but they consider the element of mercy primary.

In Ac. 4 : 9 and 10 : 38 mention is already made of Jesus' "good deed" and "good."⁷ Augustine places the "power" and the "beneficence" of Jesus side by side.⁸ For SCHLEIERMACHER, who principally considers the moral motives in the miracles, only those

¹ KOHNSTAMM, Schepper en Schepping, III, p. 205 ff.

² WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, Religion and Medicine, p. 340.

³ MACKINNON, The Historic Jesus, p. 337. In the Gospel of John it is "the sign, the evidential demonstration of his divinity, that is emphasised." "In the Synoptists the miracles are rather the proof of his humanity than of his divinity."

⁴ F. BARTH, Hauptprobleme, p. 110 . . . Barth points to Mt. 7 : 22; 12 : 27; 24 : 24; Mk. 9 : 38, which also speak of other miracle-workers. The miracles as such are no proof of Jesus' divine mission.

⁵ SCHNIEWIND, Das NTD, I, 1, p. 80. Jesus' miracles do not "prove" that He is more than a prophet. It is not a question of the size, but of the "Art des Wunders." Cf. p. 104 f. "Keine Wundererzählung will einen Machtbeweis Jesu als solchen darstellen, jede will vielmehr den Inhalt und Sinn seines Tuns beschreiben, ebenso, wie sein Wort einen ganz bestimmten Inhalt und Sinn hatte" (p. 105).

⁶ RENGSTORF, Das NTD, I, 2, p. 66. The miracles are always a part of the proclamation and display of God's rule in the person and the work of Christ. "Deshalb glaubt die Christenheit auch nicht etwa darum an Jesus, weil er Wunder getan hat; vielmehr weil sie in ihm Gott zu sich reden und an sich handeln sieht, darum glaubt sie an seine Wunder."

⁷ BERTRAM, TWNT, II, p. 651 ff. The title εὐεργέτης was often used in Roman times for gods, heroes, kings, physicians, etc. "In Ag 4, 9 ist die wunderbare Krankenheilung als eine von Gott durch die Apostel erwiesene Wohltat verstanden und 10, 38 ist die Heilandstätigkeit selbst unter den hellenistischen anthropozentrischen Gesichtspunkt des Wohltuns gestellt." Cf. FRIDRICHSEN, Le Problème du Miracle, p. 41.

⁸ SCHLINGENSIEPEN, op. cit., p. 156 f. Schlingensiepen refers to Augustine, Tract. in Evang. Joh. XVII, 1. The miracles bear witness to the potestas and the benignitas of Jesus. Cf. Origen, Comm. in Mt., XX, 32.

miracles are of importance in which Jesus' love towards mankind comes to the fore.¹

JELKE argues that it was never Jesus' intention to glorify His name, but to serve suffering mankind.² MACKINNON draws attention to the stress laid on compassion in the Synoptic Gospels.³ Jesus' answer to John the Baptist must, according to FRÖVIG, be interpreted as meaning that the miracles of Jesus, "viewed fundamentally," were acts of mercy.⁴ Various other scholars dwell at varying length on the element of compassion.⁵

¹ SCHLEIERMACHER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 207: "Die meisten sind menschenfreundlich, bloss epideiktische oder Ostentationswunder hat Christus immer abgelehnt." Attention should be paid to the cause of the miracles, viz. the supplications. Cf. p. 211 ff. Cf. FRÖVIG, *op. cit.*, p. 256: many shared Schleiermacher's view that Jesus' compassion was the motive for the miracles.

² JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 59. "Das Motiv der Wunder Jesu ist nie die Verherrlichung des eigenen Namens, sondern das Mitleid mit der Menschheit, der er hilft im Namen Gottes." Jesus' struggle with Satan is fought out where the elemental evil occurs, viz. disease . . . "So kann man sagen: die Wunder sind nicht Jesu Messiasarbeit, aber sie gehören dazu" (p. 62).

³ MACKINNON, *op. cit.*, p. 337: "In the synoptic narratives he heals mainly because he is appealed to for help, and his fellow-feeling for the sufferer prompts the response to the appeal" . . . "It is the fruit of the genuine humanity of Jesus, of his deep compassion with human suffering, and of his conception of his mission as a warfare with evil, with the nefarious effects, bodily as well as spiritual, of sin" (p. 348).

⁴ FRÖVIG, *op. cit.*, p. 260. The answer to John the Baptist is for us: "eine Norm für die Beurteilung der Wundertaten, indem sie uns zeigt, dass die Wunder, sowohl seitens Gottes als seitens Jesu, prinzipiell gesehen, Barmherzigkeitstaten gegen die gewesen sind, denen eine frohe Botschaft verkündigt wurde." Jesus displayed this mercy as the Messiah (p. 209).

⁵ BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 51: "Seine Wundermacht steht ganz im Dienste der helfenden Liebe." WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, *op. cit.*, p. 341: "In short, His miracles, though frequent, were with Him a secondary matter. As a rule, they were almost forced from Him by man's distress." RICHARDSON, *The Miracle-stories of the Gospels*, p. 32. Pity does play a part, but a secondary one. FILLION, *op. cit.*, I, p. 136. The miracles of Jesus are in fact "*œuvres de miséricorde*," but this is not the main point. A different view is that of another Roman Catholic theologian KEULERS, *Mattheüs*, p. 115: "The reason why Jesus worked miracles was in the first place his love and mercy (e.g. Mt. 14, 14; 15, 32; 20, 34)." BIELER, *op. cit.*, p. 116, says that from the point of view of the miracle-worker the "original" purpose of miracles is: "einem Notstand abzuhelpen." In paganistic miracles the element of glory does in general come to the fore, but one cannot say that here the pure "Hilfswunder" were very rare. Many miracles in the N.T. display in the first place: "den Charakter wohlthätiger Handlungen." BARTH, K.D., III, 2, points out that, as regards the "being" of Jesus the man, His fellow-men are concerned with a: "Sachverhalt von ontologischer Natur. Dass er des Nächsten barmherziger Nächster, sein Heiland ist, das äussert und zeigt sich freilich in seinen Worten, Taten und Verhaltensweisen, in seiner ganzen Geschichte, in der er freies Subjekt ist" (p. 251). Barth then

3. *Miracles as a means of arousing faith*

The Old Testament repeatedly states that the Israelites were moved to believe or were strengthened in their belief by miraculous deeds.¹ We encounter the same idea in the New Testament. Jesus reproached those cities "wherein most of his mighty works were done" with not having "repented."² The Gospel of John in particular stresses the miraculous sign as a means of arousing faith.³ Paul emphasizes the relation between the proclamation of the word and the might of signs and wonders.⁴ ORIGEN remarks that the miracles are not only symbols of certain truths, but also induced many forthwith to adopt "the admirable doctrine of the gospel."⁵ Origen further sees belief in miracles as a means of improving morals, which will be sought in vain in magicians.⁶ Various modern authors also regard Jesus' principal intention as being that miracles would lead people to spiritual insight.⁷ KLAUSNER believes that miracles were an

considers the "merkwürdige Verbum *πλαγχνίζεσθαι*." "Das Wort bezeichnet eine in des Menschen 'Eingeweiiden'—gemeint ist aber eben: in seinem Innersten, im Grund seines Seins—stattfindende Bewegung." See for instance Mk. 1 : 41; Mt. 20 : 34; Lk. 7 : 13. Man's distress not only goes to Jesus' heart: "sondern in sein Herz, in ihn selbst hinein;" he makes it: "zu seiner eigenen Sache" (p. 252).

¹ Ex. 4 : 30, 31; 14 : 31. God expected belief on the grounds of the signs which He had shown among Israel, Nu. 14 : 11. The widow of Zarephath is convinced of Elijah's mission by the resurrection of her son, 1 Ki. 17 : 24. See also 1 Ki. 18 : 39; 2 Ki. 5 : 15.

² Mt. 11 : 20-24. Cf. for the following of Jesus after a miracle Mk. 5 : 19, 20; 10 : 52; Lk. 5 : 8-11; 17 : 15, 16; 18 : 43; Mt. 20 : 34.

³ Jn. 2 : 11; 4 : 53; 6 : 14; 7 : 31 (here the miracle is not only a means of arousing belief, but also a means of recognition: the Christ is recognized by His many signs); Jn. 9 : 30-39; 11 : 15, 42, 45; 12 : 11, 17-19; 20 : 30-31.

⁴ Ro. 15 : 18, 19.

⁵ ORIGEN, c. Celsum, II, 48; 51 . . . IRENAEUS, Adv. haereses, V, 17, 2. Christ "called upon the unbelievers to do honour to the Father also by means of the mighty works that he did" (. . . et incredulos per eas quas faciebat virtutes, provocabat dare gloriam Patri).

⁶ ORIGEN, c. Celsum, I, 68: "Now, however, none of the magicians, by means of the [miracles] that he does, calls upon those who have observed [them] to better their morals, nor does he instil in those who were dumbfounded by the scenes the fear of God, nor does he endeavour to persuade the onlookers to live in such a way that they have a chance of being vindicated by God." Cf. II, 44; 50; 51.

⁷ RUPPRECHT, Das Wunder in der Bibel, p. 173: "Bei dem engen, in dieser Schrift immer wieder betonten Zusammenhang, der zwischen Gottes Wort und Gottes Wundertat besteht, wird man von vornherein annehmen müssen, dass auch das Tatwunder seinen Hauptzweck darin haben wird, Glauben zu wecken, den Glauben zu befestigen und zu stärken." PERELS, Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker, p. 20. The miracles prove that in Jesus God's dominion has begun. "Sie sollen die Menschen zum Glauben führen." EASTON,

indispensable factor for Jesus: how could He otherwise have attracted the simple people of Galilee? ¹ This therefore gives the working of miracles a psychological and pedagogic accent: Jesus regarded His miracles as publicity for His message! Doubtless the miracle stories were of great importance in the first Christian congregations, and the miracles which accompanied the preaching at the beginning were powerful and effective publicity. ² But publicity is merely a service; it recommends something and withdraws when it has done its work. If the miracles of Jesus are thus regarded purely as a means of publicity in the service of His teaching, their independent and unique nature is not appreciated.

4. *Miracles as a sign*

Again and again we encounter the view that the real significance of Jesus' miracles must be sought in their referential nature, i.e. that they are first of all meant as signs. Four questions may be asked regarding a sign: who gives the sign?; to what or to whom is it given?; what does it consist of?; for what purpose is it given? It is striking that most attention is given to the causal and final aspect, whereas the material one is very much neglected. If stress is laid on the causal aspect, God is chiefly pointed to as the cause of the miracle. The miracles present themselves as signs of His Omnipotence. For instance, Moses performed many signs at God's command which had to form the proof of his acting in the name of God. ³ If in the miracles of Jesus attention is directed solely towards Him by whose will and power Jesus performed His deeds, the miracles

Christ in the Gospels, p. 182. Jesus refused to give a sign: "but the cures as accomplished facts could at least point men's minds in the right direction." KEULERS, *Mattheüs*. For the sympathetic and above all for the apostles the miracles were "a vigorous motive for belief in his person and teachings" (p. 115). However, as the primary reason for the working of miracles Keulers gives Jesus' love and mercy. LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle*, points to the great principle: "que toutes les opérations miraculeuses accomplies par Jésus-Christ furent faites par lui au profit des hommes pour les conduire à la foi en un Dieu toute sainteté et toute bonté, et leur faire reconnaître sa propre mission comme Verbe incarné" (p. 484).

¹ KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 266, cf. p. 255.

² RICHARDSON, *The Miracle-stories of the Gospels*, p. 1: "The miracle-stories formed a characteristic part of the pedagogic technique of the earliest Christian missionaries." FRIDRICHSEN, *Le Problème du Miracle*, pp. 34 f. The miracles support missionary teaching. "La mission du christianisme primitif se distinguait de la mission juive et de la propagande de vulgarisation philosophique en ce qu'elle était liée étroitement au miracle" (p. 34). See 1 Th. 1 : 5; Ro. 15 : 19.

³ Ex. 4 : 8, 9, 17 f.; 8 : 23; 10 : 1, 2; Deu. 4 : 34; 6 : 22; 7 : 19; cf. also Judg. 6 : 17; Isa. 7 : 14; 2 Ki. 20 : 8-11.

should be regarded as signs and seals of Jesus' Messianic activities which are to identify His divine mission.¹ If attention is concentrated more on the final aspect, the miracles refer to the subject of the signs, i.e. God's action in the miracles refers to the coming era of salvation, through which they acquire an eschatological nature. In a miraculous healing, i.e. the sign, there happens in miniature what the prophets foretold as future universal salvation, i.e. the subject of the sign. A healing may then be regarded as a preview, an anticipated picture of what is presently to be in glory. The miraculous feeding may also be regarded as such; it is the anticipated Messianic feast. It will be clear that the causal and final aspects are very closely interconnected and are usually called complementary. RICHARDSON says that the miracles of Jesus are signs which attest to His message and proclaim the dawn of the new Era.² SEVENSTER remarks that the miracles refer us again and again "to something that is much more important than the miracle in itself: the coming of the Kingdom of God." The healings and miracles must be "evaluated" as signs of redemption by God. We are concerned with "God's redeeming eschatological action."³

¹ JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 14: "Σημεῖα werden die betreffenden Taten Jesu genannt in Beziehung auf ihren Grund und Zweck, insofern sie die Aufgabe haben kenntlich zu machen, dass diese oder jene Tat oder Wirkung Gott zum Urheber hat. Dieser erkennbare Zusammenhang nimmt den Wundern alles Unheimliche und Magische, alles Zauberhafte und Mirakulöse." W. MANSON, *Jesus the Messiah*. Mark's Gospel is "a Gospel of the signs of Jesus." "So Mark thinks of the words as well as the acts of Jesus as signifying a manifestation of God in history" (p. 35).

² RICHARDSON, *op. cit.*, p. 57: "There can be little doubt that the makers of the Gospel tradition understood the miracles of Jesus as 'signs' or symbolical acts which convey in a dramatized form essential Christological teaching." The miracles were "enacted parables" . . . "In the Bible a 'sign' is an occurrence, whether natural or supernatural, which authenticates a message or predicts a coming event (cf. Exod. IV, 8 f. 17; Isa. VII, 11, 14); the signs of Jesus, His miracles, authenticate His message and proclaim the dawning of the Age to come." MENOUD, *La Signification du Miracle dans le Nouveau Testament*, p. 185: "Ce qui donne aux miracles du Nouveau Testament leur caractère spécifique, c'est leur qualité de signes. Comme tels ils attestent que le règne de Dieu vient et que Dieu va mettre un terme, par la rédemption, au désordre introduit par la chute dans l'humanité et dans l'univers. Ils annoncent par prophétie la seule métamorphose qui ait un sens dans le christianisme: le passage de la forme du monde présent à la forme du monde qui vient" . . . MONDEN, *Het Wonder*, stresses the value of miracles as signs. A wonder is "in essence a divine sign directed towards man" (p. 38). Cf. p. 9 on the shift in Catholic thought: the main point of a miracle lies in its being a sign. See further p. 97 ff.

³ G. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, p. 34 f. FRIEDRICH, *TWNT*, II, p. 715: "Jesus ist der Freudenbote der erwarteten Endzeit . . . Wort und

Now in the miracles of Jesus we are doubtless concerned with deeds which are intended to be more than temporary benefactions and isolated incidents. At quite an early date an eschatological tendency was sought in the miracle stories. Justin and Irenaeus regard the resurrections performed by Jesus as signs of the resurrection before the final judgment. Why did Jesus do healings? JUSTIN says "In the first place so that there should be fulfilled what was said of him by the mouth of the prophets. . . and moreover to arouse the belief that at the resurrection the flesh as a whole will rise again. For, if he healed the weaknesses of the flesh and made the body whole on earth, he will do that still more so at the resurrection, so that the flesh also rises uninjured and whole."¹ And IRENAEUS stresses that in the healings the same limbs, eyes, hands, etc., were restored, so that these same limbs would be imperishable at the resurrection.²

Now must every miracle of Jesus first be evaluated as a sign? In our opinion care should be taken with this view. For it should be borne in mind that there is no objective standard by means of which one can say: see, now this is a sign! What is a sign to one need not ipso facto be a sign to another. TENNANT rightly says that it

Wunder, Verkündigung der frohen Botschaft und Totenauf resurrection sind Zeichen der messianischen Zeit." GOGARTEN, *Die Verkündigung Jesu Christi*, p. 99: "Denn nicht auf die Wunder und das, was unmittelbar durch sie geschieht, kommt es an, sondern auf das, für dessen Kommen sie ein Zeichen sind." That is the Kingdom of God. THURNEISEN, *Die Lehre von der Seelsorge*, p. 230. The healings in Old and New Testament: "sind ausnahmslos messianische Zeichen, d.h. Zeichen, die den Sieg des Christus über Sünde und Tod anzeigen und damit die Macht seines Wortes bekräftigen." Cf. BARTH, *K.D.* II, 1, p. 684. HUNTER, *The Words and Work of Jesus*, p. 54.

¹ JUSTIN, *De Resurrectione*, cap. 4. Cf. cap. 9: Jesus resurrected the dead to show how the resurrection would be, viz. one of both body and soul . . . JUSTIN, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 69. Jesus was no magician or seducer of the people. "But he did these things to convince also those who would believe in him that, if someone suffering from some infirmity of the body behaved as the keeper of the teachings handed down by him, in his second coming he would make him whole (ὁλόκληρον) and moreover would cause him to rise immortal and imperishable and free from pain."

² IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, V, 12, 5. "For what further reason had he to heal the limbs of the flesh and to restore them to their pristine state (restituere in pristinum characterem) if the [limbs] which were healed by him did not have to be saved?" (V, 12, 6, cf. V, 13, 1). We also find the same ideas in Augustine, Tertullian, Chrysostom, etc.; see SCHLINGENSIEPEN, *Die Wunder des N.T.*, p. 167 ff. Cf. JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *De Fide Orthodoxa*, IV, 27: Jesus resurrected the soul and the body of Lazarus as a sign both of his resurrection for eternal life and of ours (καὶ πίστωσιν τῆς αὐτοῦ τε καὶ ἡμῶν ἀναστάσεως ἡγείρε).

depends on the individual interpretation.¹ It is the view of faith, the theological outlook, that makes a miracle a sign, but even without the nature of the sign the miracle, as a happening, has value and effect. Sometimes this may be so in a very negative sense; remember the reaction of the high priests to the resurrection of Lazarus, Jn. 12 : 10, 11! The great extent to which theological speculation derives the significance of the sign from the miracle emerges from the rendering of the fourth Evangelist. The miracle stories here lack the spontaneous nature which they possess in the Synoptic versions; we find a certain circumspection and system in Jesus.² The miracles bear the stamp of signs which point to Christ, as to the true prophet, the bread of life, the triumph of light, etc., miracles which cause people to believe in Jesus as the Son of God, or at least endeavour to lead them to do so.³ How different the situation is in the Synoptists! We have already pointed out that the term "sign," in the direct sense, for a miracle of Jesus is absent from the Synoptic Gospels.⁴ PERELS therefore considers it "incorrect to speak of signs with regard to the Synoptic miracles."⁵ CAIRNS, whose opposition to the traditional view has already been mentioned elsewhere, regards the miraculous signs as "integral parts of the revelation, and not adjuncts to it."⁶ Christ, whose heart goes out to mankind, does miracles "because He cannot help working them."⁷ We believe that this view is correct. If the miracles are evaluated solely as signs and seals, there is the danger that the dynamics of the event itself, the emotion of Jesus, and also man, who is the recipient of salvation, are lost sight of or become secondary.

Here we return to what we called the material aspect. In the case of an important document attention is paid to the author, the

¹ TENNANT, *Miracle and its Philosophical Presuppositions*, p. 75: "Similarly as in the case of a wonder, a sign is constituted a sign by individual interpretation. It is unavoidable that what is a sign to one will not be a sign—of God's working—to another."

² See Jn. 2 : 4; 6 : 6; 9 : 3; 11 : 4.

³ See Jn. 2 : 11; 4 : 53; 6 : 14; 7 : 31; 9 : 38; 11 : 4, 15, 45; 12 : 11; 20 : 30, 31. See SCHLIER, *TWNT*, II, p. 28, the art. *δεικνύμι* on the works in John. "Das *δεικνύειν* ist ein im Handeln Jesu geschehendes Schenkenlassen von Werken. Die Werke Jesu tragen in ihrem Vollzug Verweisungscharakter auf Gott, sind Zeichen und können als solche in einem 'getan' und 'gezeigt' werden, was hier heisst: in ihrem Offenbarungscharakter sichtbar gemacht werden."

⁴ See the chapter: Jesus as Miracle-Worker.

⁵ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 24, Anmerkung.

⁶ CAIRNS, *The Faith that Rebels*, p. 93.

⁷ CAIRNS, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

contents of the document and the seal verifying it. The paper, i.e. the material on which the sign becomes visible, is secondary. But the miracles and signs of Jesus were not performed on paper, a dead substance; here the material consisted of living persons! In a document the material is an inanimate agent, but to Jesus men were never the passive "material" to which He wished to affix the "seal" of His power. One could say that the material itself underwent an event, and in the healings it was the people in need who as it were evoked this event! In this way God's saving love became a living thing in the healings, that is to say the Kingdom of God really existed on earth and in time for and in the healed sick.¹ In the nature miracles the Power of God revealed itself in an event which substituted itself for the "ordinary" course of things and which, just like the healing miracle, can only be truly understood by the believer. Our opinion therefore differs from that of FRIEDRICH, who considers the message weightier than the miracle, asserts that miracles serve solely to confirm the proclamation and denies the miracle an "intrinsic value."² We do not regard miracles primarily as signs, seals, ad-

¹ OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 213: "Wo Jesus hilft, da hat sich an einem bestimmten Punkte die Herrschaft Gottes realisiert, völlig freilich erst dann, wenn das Wunder in diesem Sinne auch verständnisvoll aufgenommen wird." The healings are "Teilsiege der Gottesherrschaft." Every "Teilsieg" is "Vorbote und Bürgschaft des Endsieges." FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 18: in His healings Jesus saw "die Anzeichen des Messiasieges." DAHL, *Christ, Creation and Church* (contribution in *The Background of the N.T. and its Eschatology*, in honour of C. H. Dodd, p. 442), points out that in the interpretation of the Synoptic Gospels we must take care "not to elaborate with a false antithesis between eschatology and the work and will of God the Creator. The miracles of Jesus should, for instance, hardly be understood as *either* eschatological signs *or* deeds of mercy; they are one of these things in being the other."

² FRIEDRICH, TWNT, III, p. 713 f.: "Es ist nicht so, dass die Wunder die neue Zeit herbeiführen, sondern Wunder geschehen, weil das wirkungskräftige Wort die Gottesherrschaft ausgerufen hat, und in ihr ist alles heil und gesund. Darum ist nicht das Wunder das Wichtige, sondern die Botschaft, die das Wunder schafft. Die Zeichen begleiten das Wort und dienen nur zur Bestätigung des Verkündeten Mk 16, 20, vgl. Hb 2, 3 f.; Ag. 4, 29 f.; 14, 3. . . Die Verkündigung ist die Hauptsache. Wunder haben keinen Eigenwert, sie sind nur Zeichen, dass durch die Verkündigung des Wortes die Gottesherrschaft hereingebrochen ist Mt 11, 5." In "Natural Law and Divine Miracle," a study in which HOORKAAS has recorded the results of his historical-critical investigation into "the principle of Uniformity in Geology, Biology and Theology," he says that from the religious point of view it makes no difference "whether scientific theories bear a more catastrophist or a more uniformitarian character." He goes on: "The biblical miracles are intended as 'signs,' and as such it does not matter very much whether such a sign is wrought in a 'natural' way, or seems to be 'above nature,' whether it is conformable to the rules of nature, or deviates from them. In general, what

ditions, attendant phenomena or however they are described, but see them as a function *sui generis* of the Kingdom of God.

(c) MIRACLES AS A FUNCTION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD

From the subject-matter dealt with in this chapter under (a) and (b) it may be concluded that the views mentioned there contain considerable kernels of truth. For not one of these opinions is the fruit of speculative interpretation; they all find considerable support in the data of the Gospels. The view of miracles as proof of identity corresponds to the Messianic aspect: that of miracles as a means of engendering belief corresponds to the prophetic aspect, and the priestly aspect finds its correlation in the display of mercy.

Moreover, we note how the miracle as a sign takes its obvious place among the whole of the New Testament witness.¹ And yet the fact that the miracle is *sui generis* does not find adequate expression in any of the various facets. As we already said at the end of the last section, this individuality of the miracles performed by Jesus consists in the fact that in the miracles of Jesus the Kingdom of God functions in unique fashion.

We now come to the vexed problem of what must be understood by the Kingdom of God. Theological science is still looking for an adequate formulation of the concept Kingdom of God. In the course of the Christian Era this concept has namely become the show-window in which all kinds of theological, ecclesiastical, cultural and ethical ideas and values have been put on display.² But precisely because

matters is their psychological effect rather than their essential character" (p. 225). It seems to us that it matters very much whether "such a sign . . . seems to be 'above nature'!"

¹ Cf. LUTHARDT, *Kompendium der Dogmatik*, p. 155, on the purpose of a miracle. "Teils dient es zur Legitimation der Boten Gottes, teils ist es ein wesentlicher Bestandteil der Heilsgeschichte, teils eine Abbildung des wesentlichen Heils."

² See the detailed survey in BROUWER, *Jezus en de sociale vragen*, p. 96 ff. See also among others SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, p. 14 ff.; SCHMIDT, in *TWNT*, I, p. 579 ff.; STRACK-BILLERBECK, *op. cit.*, I, p. 172 ff. The "Gottes-herrschaft" as "die Summe aller messian. Heilsgüter" is in Jesus' words "ausschliesslich ein eschatologischer Begriff;" but because the aeon of salvation has already dawned with the coming of Jesus, "das Heilsgut" can already: "in der Gegenwart von jedermann in Empfang genommen werden" (p. 181); HOLMSTRÖM, *Das eschatologische Denken der Gegenwart*; MATTER, *Nieuwere opvattingen omtrent het Koninkrijk Gods*; RIDDERBOS, *De Komst van het Koninkrijk*; HEERING, *De verwachting van het Koninkrijk Gods*. MANSON, *The Teaching of Jesus*, shrewdly remarks: "Just as every man is apt to find in Jesus his own idealized image, so every man is ready to find in the Kingdom of God his own ideal state" (p. 116). LUNDSTRÖM, *The Kingdom of God in the teaching of Jesus*.

the Kingdom of God is concerned, every attempt at a substantial description is doomed to failure. It will be possible to observe the "behaviour" of the revelation of God in miracles, the "result" of this function of the Kingdom of God, but the "how" of the function as such is and remains an absolute secret. And that is why we speak of a miracle! We can only try to express how this function appears to us, and in that case we can best define it by the words "salutary power." This power presents itself in dual form, viz. as evidential power and as militant power. As evidential power it identifies Jesus as the Messiah-King and reveals His divine mission. As militant power it reveals Jesus as the adversary of all the forces of ruin. For Jesus has come to smash the forces of disease, sin and death, to dethrone Satan.¹ This dual nature of the power function finds striking expression in Jesus' important pronouncement: "But if I cast out devils by the Spirit of God, then the Kingdom of God is come unto you," Mt. 12 : 28, and cf. Lk. 11 : 20. The evidential proof and the militant proof "prove" one another reciprocally here: the expulsion of the devils demonstrates that the Kingdom of God has come.²

¹ GRUNDMANN, TWNT, II, p. 303: "Die Wunder Jesu sind ein Stück der hereinbrechenden Gottesherrschaft, die Jesus mit seiner Person in Verkündigung und Handeln bringt, sind Gottesherrschaft, die den dämonisch-satanischen Machtbereich überwinden und zurückdrängen." Cf. K. BARTH, K. D., III, 2, p. 729: "Man beachte, dass Jesus schon die Krankheit nicht als ein natürliches, sondern als ein widernatürliches Übel angesehen hat: als einen Ausbruch und eine Auswirkung der *Dämonenwelt*, der dem positiven Willen Gottes widersprechenden und widerstehenden *Todesmacht*, die gewiss nicht ohne Gott, aber doch nur in dieser Gegensätzlichkeit und also gewiss nur vorläufig unter Gott auf dem Plane sein kann. Es wäre also völlig unsinnig, die hier in Frage kommenden Aussagen etwa in die harmlosere Sprache moderner Medizin übersetzen zu wollen." Cf. IV, 2, p. 257. The deeds of Jesus are: "ausgesprochene *Kampfhandlungen*, von Jesus vollzogen im Dienste Gottes." BETZ, Jesu heiliger Krieg, p. 125 ff.: "Mit Jesu Wirken ist das Eschaton virtuell da und der heilige Krieg hat begonnen, wenn auch der Sieg noch nicht erstritten ist" (p. 126 f.). BERKOUWER, Het werk van Christus, p. 364 ff., on Christ's victory. "Only in the light of his whole work, his Messianic work, can the signs of his power over the sick and the possessed be understood" (p. 371). SCHNACKENBURG, Gottes Herrschaft und Reich, p. 77 ff.

² For the exegesis of Mt. 12 : 28 see MATTER, Nieuwere opvattingen omtrent het Koninkrijk Gods, p. 30 ff. Matter rightly assumes that "Jesus meant by 'the Kingdom of God is come' a local, visible revelation of God's power over the powers of darkness" (p. 37). MANSON, The Teaching of Jesus, considers the version in Lk. 11 : 20, "with the finger of God," the original one (p. 82 f.). SCHWEIZER, TWNT, VI, p. 395, thinks that πνεύματι is: "wahrscheinlich Korrektur der Gemeinde." Cf. BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 174, Anm. 2, and Ergänzungsheft, p. 25.

The dynamics of the Kingdom of God becomes present, becomes static in healing; the function results in the salvation given to the body and soul of man so blessed. For the whole of man is restored. RICHARDSON puts it strikingly when he says: "Miracles of healing are, as it were, symbolic demonstrations of God's forgiveness in action."¹ Now since in miracles the kingly, saving action of God functions in an omnipotent and direct intervention in the known regularity of nature, it has both the characteristic of creation and the token of re-creation. In other words, we may regard the miracles of Jesus as deeds in which "Urzeit" and "Endzeit" meet one another, as it were. IRENAEUS, among others, drew attention to miracles as revelation of the power of the Creator. With reference to Jesus' pronouncement on the man born blind: "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him," Jn. 9 : 3, IRENAEUS says that the modelling of man is a "work of God." "The man who from his birth onwards had been blind was given sight by him not by a word, but by an operation. He did so not without reason, nor because it happened so, but to show the hand of God, [the hand] which in the beginning modelled man."² Viewed retrospectively, as a characteristic of creation, the miracle is a commemorative sign in which the glory of the "ur-zeitlich" event is reflected.

In its referential character the miracle directs attention to judgment day, it is eschatological in nature; it is, *mirabile dictu*, Future-in-the-Present; Future that functions powerfully and salutarily in the present. The presence of salvation in a miraculous healing functions at the same time as a promise of the coming salvation.

In the section "Miracles as a sign" we dwelt at length on the eschatological significance of the miracles of Jesus, but at the same time we pointed out that miracles are not only prefigurations of salvation but a gift of salvation at the time! TUINSTRA has rightly remarked that in the miracles Jesus restored communion between the

¹ RICHARDSON, *The Miracle-stories of the Gospels*, p. 61 f.

² IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, V, 15, 2: "Ei autem qui caecus fuerat a nativitate, iam non per sermonem, sed per operationem praestitit visum; non vane, neque prout evenit hoc faciens, sed ut ostenderet manum Dei, eam quae ab initio plasmavit hominem." Cf. V, 15, 3: By healing the man born blind Jesus brought to light "the whole from a part, both how it happened and by means of which hand he was modelled" (et antiquam plasmationem Adae disserens, et quomodo factus est, et per quam plasmatus est manum, ex parte totum ostendens).

Creator and His creature, albeit provisionally and incidentally.¹ This communion presupposes the expanse of the Kingdom of Heaven and it is the proof and sign of both renovation and atonement. In other words, in miracles the Kingdom of God came and salvation was brought. NOORDMANS, who defines the miracles of Jesus as "parables-in-action," which are directed towards judgment day, says at the same time: "Jesus is no philanthropist. He is the Saviour, Emmanuel, God with us. Jesus helps man by conveying him from the fallen creation into the Kingdom of Heaven."² Indeed. And, invoking ORIGEN's well-known words that Jesus is the auto-basileia, that He is the Kingdom of God personified,³ we can also put it this way: in the miracle the salutary power functions of the Lord's Anointed who, after reading Isa. 61 : 1, 2 in the synagogue at Nazareth said: "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears," Lk. 4 : 21.

¹ TUINSTR, *Het symbool in de Psycho-analyse*, p. 220: "In the miracles Jesus restores communion between Creator and creature—albeit provisionally and incidentally. By so doing he gives expression as a matter of course to the character of his mission and the essence of his person." RIDDERBOS, *De komst van het Koninkrijk*, points out that "in *all* Jesus' miraculous power the coming of the Kingdom is realized and proof lies of his presence" (p. 72). "Jesus' miracles have an in all respects organic and 'natural' place in the idea of the coming of the Kingdom insofar as in them, in all kinds of ways, the restoration of the Creation and accordingly the all-embracing and redeeming significance of the Kingdom of Heaven becomes visible" (p. 73). BARTH, K.D., III, 1, p. 33 ff.: "An Jesus Christus glauben ist ein Leben in der *Gegenwart* des Schöpfers." For the person who believes in Jesus Christ: "ist in seiner Person der *Schöpfer* auf den Plan getreten" (p. 34).

² NOORDMANS, *Herscheping*, p. 132. BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 242: the miracles of Jesus are "Reichswunder," for that reason they are genuine and absolute.

³ ORIGENES, *Comm. in Evangelium sec. Matth.* Tom. XIV, 7. "αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ ὥσπερ αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ αὐτοσοφία, καὶ ἡ αὐτοδικαιοσύνη, καὶ ἡ αὐτοαλήθεια, οὕτω μῆποτε καὶ ἡ αὐτοβασίλεια;"

III. RELATIONS INVOLVED IN THE MIRACLES OF JESUS

The miracles of Jesus do not exist in strict isolation. There are many threads linking them to other data and problems, for in a miraculous healing the question of the relation between disease and sin immediately arises. Is there a relation between healing and prayer, and how must it be regarded if there is? And there are more questions, which we shall consider by means of the following points.

- (a) Disease and sin.
- (b) Forgiveness and healing.
- (c) Miracles and faith.
- (d) Miracles and prayer.
- (e) Miracles and the word.
- (f) Miracles and salvation.

(a) *The relation between disease and sin*

The belief that disease is a punishment which spirits and gods can in their wrath inflict on man is a universal one. Out of sheer anger, or because he feels himself offended by some negligence or the other on the part of men, the spirit brings down all kinds of diseases and disasters upon the heads of his victims. To the Ancient Greeks Apollo was the god of healing, but in his wrath this sun god could also afflict men with serious disease, mainly plague. The Indian god Rudra fired his disease-bearing arrows at his victims. In the Babylonian penitential psalms we repeatedly encounter the view that disease is the consequence of and a punishment for the sins of man.¹

¹ For the view held by primitive peoples cf. HEILER, *Das Gebet*, p. 87: "Unglück und Not, vor allem Krankheit, ist für den primitiven Menschen eine Folge des Zornes eines höheren Wesens, den man auf irgendeine Weise, sei es durch Verletzung eines Ritualgebetes, sei es durch die Übertretung der von Gott gesetzten ethischen Ordnung, erregt hat." For the Babylonians see VAN SELMS, *De Babylonische termini voor zonde*, p. 29: "For the Babylonians it was an established fact that all suffering and disease could be a consequence of sins." According to Van Selms these sins must not only be understood "cultically and ritually" but also verified against their ethical content (p. 106). See also OEPKE, *TWNT*, IV, p. 1084 ff. DE JONG, *Demonische Ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel*. STIGERIST, *A History of Medicine*; IV, *Mesopotamia*, p. 377 ff.

Even today in India we still come across both the idea that disease is caused by spirits and the view that it is a punishment for sinning.¹

In many places in the Old Testament we encounter the idea that not only individual sins, but also those performed collectively, are punished by God with disease and disaster.² The penitential psalms in particular concern themselves with the relation between sin and disease; since the poet has infringed the divine commandments, he must undergo all kinds of sufferings.³ Often the disease is plastically described: the eye is consumed, bones are vexed, the heart pants, etc. Often too, reference is made to disease and infirmity without these being related to sin.⁴ The prophets, especially Jeremiah, use disease on a number of occasions as a figure of speech to give expression to the disastrous situation of the people of Israel as a result of their defection from God.⁵ For the God of Israel is a holy God, who wants man to observe His law and live in accordance with His will. "Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy," Lev. 19 : 2.

¹ RIVERS, *Medicine, Magic and Religion*, p. 69: "The folk medicine of India at the present time is chiefly based on the belief that disease depends upon possession by a spirit, and the historians of Indian medicine speak of possession as characteristic of its earliest stage" . . . "In India we also meet the idea of disease as a punishment for sin, the beings who thus inflict disease when offended including both ghosts of ancestors and Gods."

² See Ex. 15 : 26; 23 : 25; Lev. 26 : 16; Nu. 11 : 33; 14 : 12; Deu. 7 : 14, 15; 28 : 21, 22, 59 ff.; 29 : 22, 23; 2 Sa. 24 : 15; 2 Ki. 1 : 2-4; 5 : 27; 2 Ch. 21 : 14, 15, 18, 19; Job 5 : 18; Isa. 17 : 10, 11; 19 : 22; Jer. 16 : 4; 21 : 6; Hos. 6 : 1; Amos 4 : 10. Compare Deu. 24 : 9 with Nu. 12 : 1-16. Cf. CAIRNS, *The Faith that Rebels*, p. 58: "Disease, premature death, poverty, famine, pestilence, national defeat, disaster, captivity, all the ills to which flesh is heir, are constantly described in the Old Testament as due to man's folly and sin. The Hebrew never accepts them as part of the unchangeable nature of things. He is persuaded that they have no permanent place in God's world, and that they ought not to be, and would not be if only men with all their hearts turned to God." DE JONG, *Demonische Ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel*, says that in principle the Old Testament recognizes the same causes of disease as Babylonian medicine. A number of "natural" causes are mentioned (e.g. Gen. 34 : 25; Jos. 5 : 8; Gen. 32 : 25, 32; 2 Sa. 4 : 4; Gen. 27 : 1; 1 Sa. 25 : 37; Nu. 21 : 6, 9), but besides these God also functions as the author of disease (p. 81 ff.). "In that case the sick person was someone who had aroused God's righteous wrath, speaking in Biblical terms an unclean person or a sinner" (p. 85).

³ Ps. 6 : 2; 31 : 12; 38 : 2-11; 39 : 10; 41 : 4; 88 : 3, 7; 107 : 17-20.

⁴ Cf. BRONGERS, *Enkele opmerkingen over het verband tussen zonde en ziekte enerzijds en vergeving en genezing anderzijds in het O.T.*, p. 130 . . . Here the various Hebrew verbs for disease can be found, together with lexicological details.

⁵ Isa. 1 : 5, 6; Hos. 5 : 13; Jer. 14 : 17; 29 : 17; 30 : 12-15.

From this follows the observation: "that whosoever does God's will finds God's pleasure, and whosoever does not do God's will experiences God's displeasure."¹ In Judaism the system of retribution is maintained unabridged and is elaborated. There is no suffering without guilt and no death without sin.² Now did Jesus take over this dogma of retribution in all its force? The Gospels reveal that it was an iron rule for His contemporaries, too. But Jesus eliminated the terror from this doctrine. He did not lay down a broad theory about the relation between sin, disease and death, any more than He did for sin as such. Whilst retaining the interrelation as such of sin, disease and death, as coming under the dispensation and the judgment of God, He: (a) detached the concept of retribution from the personal sphere; (b) liberated it from the rigid framework of the idea of causality and (c) directed man's gaze towards finality. This is evident from what Jesus said about this matter on a number of occasions. In the account of the relation between guilt and suffering, Lk. 13 : 1-5, Jesus asks whether the victims mentioned there should be regarded as "sinners above all men." He answers His own question with: "I tell you, Nay," thus opposing the idea that

¹ BROUWER, *De Bergrede*, p. 105. Cf. DE GROOT-HULST, *Macht en Wil*, Ch. V, "Wat God eist," pp. 263-295. In the Book of Job, however, the mechanistic relation between sin and disaster is disputed; cf. also Ps. 37 and Ps. 73. . . .

² Shabbath 55a: "R. Ammi said: There is no death without sin¹), and there is no suffering without iniquity. There is no death without sin, for it is written, The soul that sinneth, it shall die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son, the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him, etc.²) There is no suffering without iniquity, for it is written, Then will I visit their transgressions with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes"³) (ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman).

¹) One's sins cause his death. ²) Ezek. XVIII, 20. ³) Ps. LXXXIX, 33.

Nedarim 41a: "R. Alexandri said in the name of R. Hiyya b. Abba: A sick man does not recover from his sickness until all his sins are forgiven him, as it is written, Who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases¹). R. Hammuna said: He [then] returns to the days of his youth, for it is written, His flesh shall be fresher than a child's: he shall return to the days of his youth"²) (ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman).

¹) Ps. CIII, 3. ²) Job XXXIII, 25.

See STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 495 f. and II, p. 193 ff. . . . Cf. OEPKE, TWNT, IV, p. 1086: "Das Judentum hat die Vergeltungslehre auch bezüglich der Krankheit als eigtl. Zentraldogma virtuos ausgebildet." OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 200 f. STÄHLIN-GRUNDMANN, TWNT, I, p. 294. RIDDERBOS, *De komst van het Koninkrijk*, p. 196: "The idea of retribution is and remains the great dominant of the Jewish doctrine of redemption." See for the doctrine of retribution among others DE BEUS, *Jezus en de Wet*, pp. 64-69 and pp. 113-117.

the extent of sin and punishment can be measured by the extent of the suffering. Jesus does not deal with the problem of suffering *ad fundum*; He does not investigate whether these were "chastisements out of love," or chastisements because of guilt, as the Rabbis assumed; what He does is to remove the personal atmosphere.¹

The account of the suffering of the man born blind does not contain a profound discussion either. The disciples ask: "Master, who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?"² The disciples believed that the cause had to be sought in one or the other. Jesus' reply: "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents: but that the works of God should be made manifest in him" does not contain a direct refutation of the belief in the relation between sin and disease³—

¹ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*: "Zwar bestreitet er nicht, dass sie ihr Schicksal durch Sündhaftigkeit verdient haben werden (anders Jo 9, 3), wohl aber, dass sie grössere Sünder gewesen sind als andere—wobei die Frage, 'warum denn Gott gerade an ihnen ein Exempel statuierte,' allerdings offen bleibt (Wellhausen)." Cf. KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*; RIDDERBOS, *De komst van het Koninkrijk*, p. 235. BULTMANN, *Jesus*, p. 157, is right in thinking that Jesus did not give: "eine für den Menschen einsichtige Erklärung des Leidens," but this does not mean that Jesus did not know of the demand for the theodicy (p. 156). JÜNCKER, *Jesus u. das Leid*, calls it very remarkable: "dass in Jesu gesamter Verkündigung unmittelbare Hinweise auf das allgemeine Leidensproblem sich kaum irgendwo vorfinden" (p. 8). "Es bestätigt sich immer aufs neue, dass Jesus der theoretischen Frage nach dem Warum des Leidens kein Interesse entgegengebracht hat" (p. 15). Jesus does not work to a fixed plan. "Denn er forscht den Kranken nicht nach und geht ihnen nicht nach" (p. 17). BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 247. Jesus does not ask after the past and the sin; He does not impress these upon the sick person, but creates a new future for him. "Er . . . lässt ihn ganz schlicht als Kreatur leben. Er darf wieder aufstehen und gehen, wieder sehen, hören, reden" (p. 246). Barth rightly speaks here of: "das überaus Merkwürdige, um nicht zu sagen Anstössige, in den neutestamentlichen Wundertexten," which scholars have often tried to tone down a little. RENGSTORF, *TWNT*, I, p. 333, points out that Jesus did not give His disciples any: "Lehre von der Sünde"; "Er hat nicht einmal ausgesprochen, was er unter 'Sünde' verstehe. Dagegen hat er mit der Wirklichkeit der Sünde gerechnet, und nicht nur das, sondern er hat sein gesamtes Wort und Werk in deutlicher Bezogenheit auf die Sünde geschehen lassen."; FROST, *Christian Healing*, p. 273 ff., Ch. XV, *The relation between sin and disease*.

² Jn. 9 : 3. For the idea of the sin of the parents see Ex. 20 : 5; Nu. 14 : 18; Deu. 5 : 9; Jer. 31 : 29; Eze. 18 : 2 . . . For the idea of sin by the child see Gen. 25 : 22; Ps. 51 : 5; 58 : 3. For both lines of reasoning in Judaism see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 527 ff. *The Essenes, Philo of Alexandria, etc.*, taught of the pre-existence of good and evil souls.

³ UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes*, says that Jesus leaves the popular theory of retribution "for what it is." BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, puts forward the idea that Jesus' word refers to this special case . . . IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, V, 15, 2, concludes from Jn. 5 : 14 that Jesus in this way signified that disease emanates for men from the sin of disobedience (*manifestans quoniam propter inobedientiae peccatum subsecuti sunt languores hominibus*).

cf. Jesus' words to the healed paralytic in Bethesda, Jn. 5 : 14 — but poses a *tertium datur*! This other possibility is the shift of emphasis from the cause of the suffering to the object thereof. On both occasions Jesus made that clear. The death of the Galileans had to be understood as the summons to conversion, for everyone lives under the judgment of God. The healing of the man born blind had to reveal the "great works" of God. RIDDERBOS points out that in the latter case "not the judgment, but the glory of God in grace" is designated as the significance of the suffering.¹ Jesus demonstrated that the answer to the relation between sin and disease must not be sought in an attempt to explain the causal connection for each case, but in the spiritual understanding of the will and the intention of God in all suffering that overcomes every man.² He pointed to the character of service displayed by every form of suffering, individual and collective, or, as KEULERS puts it, Jesus gave a "positive value" to suffering.³

¹ RIDDERBOS, op. cit., p. 236, note 128: "The suffering, the disasters, etc., do not only contain a prelude to God's eternal judgment. There is also suffering in which God glorifies Himself through Christ in His grace and which accordingly becomes a model and a prelude of eternal redemption" . . . Cf. also Jn. 11 : 4: the glory of God had to become manifest in Lazarus' illness and death. See LINDYER, *Het lijden in het N.T.*, p. 64 . . . GÖDAN, *Christus u. Hippokrates*, p. 142 ff., regards suffering as an "enemy", who must serve us as a slave. We may not become "collaborators" of suffering. "Das Leid soll nicht intendiert werden, sondern interniert" (p. 144). The neurologist and psychiatrist FRANKL, *Homo patiens*, p. 59 ff., says on the other hand that the ordinary man also discerns the: "Leidensfähigkeit als Wert." He then means: "rechtes, aufrechtes Leiden." "Leiden heisst leisten und heisst wachsen. Aber es heisst auch reifen . . . Ja, die eigentliche Leistung des Leidens ist nicht anderes als ein Reifungsprozess" (p. 65). Human existence is: "zutiefst und zuletzt Passion"; it is: "das Wesen des Menschen ein leidender zu sein: Homo patiens" (p. 67). There is not only ratio und actio, but also passio. Suffering must be accepted and "managed." "Nur das intendierte Leiden hört auf Leiden zu sein" (p. 69). Meaningful suffering par excellence is "das Opfer" (p. 69). JAKOBOVITS, *Jewish Medical Ethics*, p. 103, points to the difference in appreciation of pain between Jews and Christians: "... in general, Christianity is distinctly more panegyric in its commendation of physical suffering than is Judaism."

² Cf. the various aspects among which BARTH, K.D., III, 4, pp. 404-426, considers health and disease. ELZINGA, *Geloof en geneeskunde*, calls sin a dis-integration in human existence. So is disease. "Disease is not the same as sin, but disease is a symptom of sin." Disease is: "a form of concretization of sin" (p. 65 . . . It has been rightly commented that the word "concretization" sounds too "mechanical;" disease is not simply "sin," but "signum of the kingdom of sin," see *Vragen rondom de gebedsgenezing*, p. 33). See also THURNEYSEN, *Die Lehre von der Seelsorge*, pp. 203-209, on "Krankheit und Sünde." The "Entsprechung" between sin and disease can be recognized only by faith (p. 205).

³ KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*, p. 222 f. Keulers summarizes the significance

(b) *Forgiveness and healing*

Sin and disease, forgiveness and healing are inseparably bound up with one another in the Old Testament. The God who in His wrath punishes with disease and disaster when His commandments are spurned or broken is the same God who forgives the sins and grants healing when man turns to Him in humility and repentance. God hears prayers for aid.¹ He first grants forgiveness, followed immediately by healing.² He forgives Israel for its lapses and heals the breach in His people.³ BRONGERS has demonstrated how closely the concepts of forgiveness and healing are interwoven. He points to a number of texts to which both the translation "healing" and that of "forgiveness" could be applied.⁴ Judaism adhered scrupulously to the idea that nobody other than God could forgive guilt. Though the Messiah might exterminate the godless in Israel, smash the power of demons, protect His righteous people against the rule

of suffering as follows: "It is participation in his [Jesus'] suffering as Redeemer, a source of power and even of inner happiness, a means of self-sanctification, and finally a guarantee of eternal bliss" . . . We find more or less related ideas in Blumhardt. SCHREUDER, *De overwinningsgedachte bij J. C. Blumhardt*, draws from Blumhardt's works the conclusion that according to Blumhardt the suffering Saviour is "represented" in our suffering. In disease it is really the Saviour who is ill. We contribute towards the suffering of all creation (see p. 63 ff.) . . . But can one speak of "der kranke Heiland," as Blumhardt does? Thinking of the healings which Jesus performed as "servant of the Lord," we are reminded of Mt. 8 : 17 (= Isa. 53 : 4). The Gospels several times point to Jesus' compassion and pity, but in our opinion Mt. 8 : 17 will have to be taken as referring to the removing, the bearing away of disease, as a load is borne away, rather than to suffering by Jesus Himself. In the healings we perceive as it were the dawn of the whole serving, redeeming and conquering work of Jesus Christ in His suffering, sacrifice and resurrection, of His triumph.

¹ See Gen. 20 : 17 (healing after intercession); Ps. 30 : 2; 41 : 4; Isa. 19 : 22; 38 : 1-8; Jer. 17 : 14. See also 1 Ki. 8 : 37-40; 2 Ch. 6 : 28-31.

² 2 Ch. 7 : 14; Ps. 103 : 3; Ps. 147 : 3; Isa. 19 : 22; 38 : 17; 57 : 18, 19. BRONGERS, *op. cit.*, p. 139, points out that as soon as forgiveness has become a fact, healing occurs too. "It is true that forgiveness precedes healing, but the difference in time is so small that the actions seem to coincide and רפא can sometimes be translated just as well by *forgive* as by *heal*." . . . BRONGERS has carefully examined the three Hebrew verbs for "heal": רפא, חבש, גהה in their contexts and believes that רפא must not be translated everywhere by "heal." In Jer. 17 : 14 it can best be translated by "help;" in Hosea 11 : 3 by "love."

³ Jer. 3 : 22; 6 : 14; 8 : 11; 33 : 6; Hos. 7 : 1; 11 : 3 . . . In Isa. 30 : 26 the healing has eschatological significance, cf. Isa. 33 : 24. For the connection between obedience to God's commandments and blessing see Deu. 7 : 12-16.

⁴ Ps. 41 : 4; Jer. 3 : 22; Hos. 14 : 4; cf. also 2 Ch. 30 : 20, where "healed" must mean "forgave," since the account mentions no disease or plague, and Deu. 30 : 3 and Sir. 28 : 3 in the Septuagint; see BRONGERS, *op. cit.*, p. 137 f.; OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 202 f.

of sin and intercede for them, only God could forgive sins.¹ In the New Testament, too, we repeatedly encounter the statement that God forgives sins.²

However, in two places in the Gospels it is explicitly stated that Jesus had the power to forgive sins. The account of the healing of the paralytic refers to the stirring controversy between Jesus and the leaders of the Jews on the point of the remission of sins. "Why doth this man thus speak blasphemies? who can forgive sins but God only,?" said the scribes and the Pharisees to themselves when Jesus had received the paralytic with the words: "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." And as proof "that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins," Jesus caused the paralytic to stand up and walk before the eyes of the bystanders.³ The relation between forgiveness and healing comes clearly to the fore here: the forgiveness of guilt is followed forthwith by healing — upon a second pronouncement by Jesus! — so that the whole man received salvation, both in soul and in body. PEDERSEN has said some profound and striking things about the intimate relation between soul and body, in the eyes of the Israelites, about the salvation and calamity of man in his totality. It is sin that makes the soul sick. "Bodily suffering cannot be something isolated. It is the soul that suffers, being dissolved, powerless, devoid of vitality, and the power to keep upright."⁴ This sin can come from inside and from outside, but, however that may be, the soul is guilty and bears the responsibility therefor. Man can become whole, healthy, sound only when the breach caused by sin has been restored and healed, when God forgives the guilt.⁵

¹ See STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 495 f.

² Among others in the preaching of John the Baptist; Mt. 6 : 12 and parallel passage; Lk. 15 : 11-32, the parable of the prodigal son. See RIDDERBOS, *De komst van het Koninkrijk*, § 27, "De vergeving der zonden," pp. 189-208; BULTMANN TWNT, I, p. 505 ff. Bultmann points out that: "die Vergebung als eschatologisches Ereignis den *ganzen* Menschen erneuert, an welchem die Sünde nicht etwas Einzelnes und Gelegentliches, sondern die sein ganzes Sein bestimmende Macht war." (Cf. note 5 on restoring man *in his totality* to health.)

³ Cf. Mk. 2 : 1-12; Mt. 9 : 1-8; Lk. 5 : 17-26. HUNTER, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, p. 87: "In such a story as that of the healing of the paralytic man in Mk. ii 1-12, it is of capital importance to note that the words 'Child, thy sins are forgiven thee,' are not merely declaratory but effective."

⁴ PEDERSEN, *Israel, its Life and Culture*, I-II, p. 445.

⁵ BRONGERS, *op. cit.*, p. 141. Cf. also VAN LEEUWEN, *Eirène in het N.T.* THURNEISEN, *Die Lehre von der Seelsorge*, p. 229 ff. ALBERTZ, *Die Botschaft des N.T.*, II, 1, p. 73. The greatest miracle that the "word" works is that of the forgiveness of sins. It is: "das entscheidende Zeichen dafür, das mitten in dieser

In the healing of the paralytic we perceive this joint occurrence of forgiveness and healing, this complete recovery of soul and body, as a redemptive deed by Jesus. For Jesus does not merely proclaim that forgiveness is possible; He brings it, He grants it to the sick sinner by virtue of His power as Son of man. BRONGERS rightly says that Jesus' views on the relation between forgiveness and healing prove to go back to Old Testament notions. "For at all places in the Bible where reference is made to the forgiveness of guilt, we are looking into the heart of the gospel."¹

We also look into that "heart" in the account of the pardon of the sinner who anointed Jesus' feet, Lk. 7 : 47, 48. In this case, however, forgiveness does not relate to disease and healing. We may also recall the story of Zacchaeus, to whose house "salvation" was given, Lk. 19 : 1-10.

In His announcement and granting of remission of sins, Jesus indicates what man's essential distress is. This does not consist in his transient lot in life, with its many vicissitudes, but in his alienation from the living God, in his life in sin and guilt. It is from this that man must be redeemed, and it is from this that Jesus does in fact redeem him!

As regards the relation between forgiveness and healing, three further points deserve attention. Firstly, as BRONGERS has remarked, it may be assumed that the other accounts of healings also involved the

Zeit, mitten in dieser sündigen Welt, schon das Heil da ist in dem Heiland, der sagt: mein Sohn, meine Tochter, dir sind deine Sünden vergeben." SEESEMAN, TWNT, V, p. 175, rightly says that in Jn. 7 : 23 the "healing of the sick man in his entire being" is meant. "Die Heilungen die Jesus vollzieht, bedeuten ja Heilungen des *ganzen* Menschen, ebenso: die Sündenvergebung bedeutet ein Gesundmachen des *ganzen* Menschen." Cf. OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 212, on the compassionate love of Jesus. "Die Eigenart dieser Liebe liegt sowohl in ihrer Intensität wie in ihrer Extensität, vor allem aber darin, dass sie in eigenartiger Weise den ganzen äusseren und inneren Menschen umfasst."

¹ BRONGERS, op. cit., p. 142. Cf. PERELS, Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker, p. 69, who points to the two series of thoughts which are in close relation to one another: (a) disease and sin are caused by demoniac powers; (b) disease and death are the consequence of sin. "Besonders die zweite Anschauung, die ja auch im Alten Testament bekannt ist, spiegelt sich mit Deutlichkeit in der Geschichte vom Gichtbrüchigen; und der ganze Glaube an die Beziehung von Krankheit und Sünde, Heilung und Vergebung, steht hinter der engen Verwandtschaft von Heilungs- und Vergebungsbericht in den Evangelien." REITZENSTEIN, Poimandres, p. 180, sees in the forgiveness of sins in Christianity "das Neue." It is absent from Hellenism... GARADOG JONES, Spiritual Healing, p. 136f.: "Healing has always been associated with cleansing . . . This is why the preaching of the gospel and the healing of the sick should go together."

question of the forgiving of guilt, or at least that this is constantly tacitly presupposed.¹ He also puts his finger on another important matter, viz. that there can be no question of a causal connection between forgiveness and healing. "Neither forgiveness nor healing works *ex opere operato*, but depends on the grace of God."² This is of particular importance. Jesus said on several occasions that a sick person had been saved by his "faith" or that of another. Now this faith was a condition of healing, but never a cause of healing, as if healing had to follow always and automatically on the faith of the patient! For faith, forgiveness and healing are all three in essence dispensations of the grace of God. This implies that the relations between these three are not governed by the law of causality but by the will and the intention of God. There is thus a great difference between this view and the opinion of Seng. SENG namely sees Jesus' words: "thy sins be forgiven thee," Mk. 2 : 5, as "decisive words" which do away with the inner inhibitions, whose outer form was the paralysis. We would thus be concerned here with a mental mechanism of origin.³

Thirdly we may say that healing and forgiveness both manifest themselves in one and the same reality, viz. in that of victory. In forgiveness Jesus conquers the power of the Prince of Darkness in the heart of man; in healing He conquers the power of evil in his body. Now as a work of salvation these victories form a unity in which the power of evil in the double aspect of the cause of disease — viz. by sin or by diabolical influences — is radically smashed. In this double triumph the Kingdom of God functioned in such surprising force that the multitudes were amazed and glorified God, because He truly redeemed them from every distress.⁴

¹ BRONGERS, *op. cit.*, p. 130. . . . NOACK, *Satanas u. Soteria*, p. 126 f., is of the opinion that the texts nowhere state that: "mit der Vertreibung der Dämonen eine ethische Besserung des Betroffenen eintrete, oder dass etwa die Dämonen-vertreibung Sündenvergebung bedeute." The demons in the New Testament are not "seducers," but merely "tormentors," according to Noack; cf. p. 65.

² BRONGERS, *op. cit.*, p. 130. . . . ELZINGA, *Geloof en geneeskunde*, strikingly calls healing "a form of concretization of grace" (p. 74), just as he calls disease "a form of concretization of sin" (p. 65).

³ SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 17: "Die Vergebung der Sünden räumt gewissermassen die inneren Dinge fort, deren äusserer Ausdruck die Lähmung war, und schaffte so in dem Kranken die Voraussetzung dafür, dass er die darauf folgende Weisung befolgen konnte." SENG cannot imagine that the "palsy" has to be taken to mean what is now called gout; so rapid a change in the joints seems impossible to him.

⁴ RIDDERBOS, *De komst van het Koninkrijk*, p. 76: "For the Kingdom of God,

(c) *Miracles and faith*

The Gospels contain a great deal of information which bears witness to the very close connection between miracles and faith. Before discussing the relation as such, we should like to bring some order into this information. The following may then be remarked:

(a) In the first place we are struck by the absence of the relation. Miracles are not believed, or not accepted as a sign. We find several examples of this in the Old Testament. When Moses was appointed Israel's saviour, God gave him the power to perform a number of miraculous signs, which could be believed or disbelieved.¹ Israel often had to hear the reproach that it had no eyes and ears for the great deeds and miracles of the Lord.² Jezebel did not believe in Elijah's deed of power on Mount Carmel.³ The miracles of Jesus were believed by a large multitude of His contemporaries, but many paid little or no attention to them.⁴ In the Gospel of John in particular repeated reference is made to the disbelief and the annoyance of the Jews.⁵

(b) It is stated on many occasions that belief in Jesus' power was present before miracles, i.e. healings. When this faith was "seen"

which manifests itself in miracles, means deliverance from all evil and the restoration of all life." Cf. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa Theologiae*, III, qu. XLIV, art. III. Jesus performed miracles by divine might: "Now the work of God is perfect, as is said in Deu. 32. But nothing is perfect if it does not achieve its purpose. Now the purpose of the external healing performed by Christ is the healing of the soul, and it therefore did not suit Christ's purpose to heal a man's body without healing his soul" (*Dei autem perfecta sunt opera, ut dicitur Deute 32. Non est autem aliquid perfectum, si finem non consequatur. Finis autem exterioris curationis per Christum factae, est curatio animae, et ideo non conveniebat Christo, ut alicuius corpus curaret, nisi eius curaret animam*). DE JONG, *Demonische Ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel*, believes that in His medical activity Jesus "originally" proceeded on the assumption that disease is a consequence of God's wrath. The sick man is *for that reason* a sinner. But if God punishes the sinner, how can He then permit him to be healed? This is possible only if the healing at the same time entails forgiveness of sins. But then the divine aetiology of disease must be abandoned: Satan is the cause of disease! The sick person is thus a victim of God's enemy (p. 98 ff.).

¹ Ex. 4 : 1-9. Cf. Ex. 4 : 31, the people believed the signs.

² Nu. 14 : 22; Deu. 1 : 30-33; Ne. 9 : 16, 17; Ps. 78 : 32.

³ 1 Ki. 19 : 1-22.

⁴ The Pharisees and scribes, see for instance Mt. 12 : 9-14 and parallel passages; Mt. 12 : 24 and parallel passages; Jesus' native town, Mt. 13 : 53-58 and parallel passages; the cities of Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum, Mt. 11 : 20-24 and parallel passage.

⁵ Jn. 6 : 26; 7 : 5 (the disbelief of Jesus' brothers); 10 : 37, 38 (Jesus asks that His works be believed); 12 : 10, 11, 37, 43; 14 : 11.

by Jesus, Mt. 9 : 2 and parallel passages, He took pity on those seeking help.

In some cases Jesus "probed" the faith before He helped.¹

(c) Repeated references are made to faith after the miracle has been performed. Overwhelmed by the deeds of Jesus, many came to believe.²

It emerges from the above data that for Jesus Himself there was a close link between miracles and faith. But the various problems are in no way solved by the realization that this bond exists. In the first place we must ask ourselves whether this connection also existed with regard to Jesus' own faith, as some believe. It is then supposed that His personal faith enabled Jesus to perform miracles and that this faith was a stimulating factor for the healing of the sick. His healing miracles would therefore have to be regarded as acts of faith.³ In our opinion this theory finds little if any support in the Gospels, in which we only sporadically find a trail which might lead to something about Jesus' faith.⁴

¹ Mt. 8 : 5-13 and parallel passage; Mt. 15 : 21-28 and parallel passage; Mt. 9 : 28 (Believe ye that I am able to do this?); Mk. 9 : 21-24.

² Mt. 14 : 33 (after the stilling of the storm); Jn. 7 : 31; 11 : 45, 48 (the fear of the Jewish council that through Jesus' many miracles "all men" will believe in Him!); 12 : 11. Cf. also 20 : 30, 31.

³ TITUS, *Natur u. Gott*, p. 778: "Dass Jesu gewaltiger einzigartiger Glaubensmut ihn zu wunderbaren Heilkuren befähigen konnte, wird kein Heilkundiger bestreiten wollen. Die Grenzen bestimmen zu wollen, in denen sich dies Charisma zu betätigen vermochte, wäre Vermessenheit." Paul also possessed the gift. JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 60: "Seine Wunder sind Glaubensstaten." That is why Jesus also demands faith from men. MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 345. Jesus had received His power of healing from God. "The possibility of these 'mighty works' lies in the absolute faith in an immanent God, which inspires him to do them." One must have faith in Jesus, but: "Most potently operative is the faith of Jesus himself" (p. 346). BROOKS-CHARLES, *De genezingen van Emile Coué en de wonderen Jezus*, p. 34: Jesus' power of healing consisted in His unshakable faith. VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *Parapsychologie en Godsdiensitig leven*, p. 61, says that the central datum of inner nature in the healing accounts is faith, viz. that of those desirous of salvation and the strength of the healer's faith.

⁴ SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, p. 28 f. Sevenster refers to Mk. 11 : 20 ff., Mt. 21 : 20-22; Mk. 9 : 23; Mt. 27 : 43. Sevenster remarks that nowhere is Jesus' faith spoken of in "clear words." In connection with He. 12 : 2 (Jesus is the author and finisher of our faith) Sevenster believes that "what is meant is not the faith of a man pure and simple, but the faith of the Son of God in his human life of struggle and temptation." Cf. KORFF, *Christologie*, I, p. 199: "That Jesus lived from faith is stated with absolute clarity in the New Testament in He. 12 : 2." See also II, p. 162 f., 224 f., in connection with Jesus' passion and resurrection.

As regards the inner relation of Jesus as the Son to the Father, we can only say something in reverentially broad terms. Whatever one's further opinion is of Jesus' faith, we nowhere find in the Gospels the idea that the relation between Jesus and the patient was one of faith to faith.

The second question is: what value must be attached to the faith of the sick or their helpers? It appears time after time from the Gospels that this faith was an essential factor. As words of redemption in the ears of the sick were Jesus' assurances: "thy faith hath made thee whole," or "as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee."¹

Did this faith possess a special nature, since it was praised so highly by Jesus? Some believe that a certain power must be accorded to it. It was a contributory source of power; the sick person contributed towards the healing by his inner disposition.² But we nowhere encounter this idea in the accounts of healings. There is no question of a certain interaction between Jesus and the sick or of a mysterious causal connection between the sick person's faith and his healing. Everywhere the healing is described as a deed which

¹ Mt. 9 : 22 and parallel passages, Lk. 17 : 19; 18 : 42. Mt. 8 : 13 (as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee); Mt. 9 : 29. Cf. also Mk. 9 : 24; Jn. 4 : 50 (Go thy way, thy son liveth) and Ac. 3 : 16 (healing through faith in Jesus' name) and Ac. 14 : 9 (faith to be healed) . . . KOOLE, *Gave der genezing*, p. 19, rightly comments that Jesus, in His miraculous healings, encountered two kinds of people, viz. "those who have heard of Him and know Him, and others who do not know Him or recognize Him." This distinction must be borne in mind with regard to the question of the extent to which "faith" might be regarded as decisive for healing.

² FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 94, assumes that in the case of the healing of the woman with an issue the inner disposition to healing was given. DE RÉGLA, *Jésus de Nazareth*, p. 157, sees in the faith of the centurion, Mt. 8 : 5-13, a power which concentrates on the force and in that way heals him. G. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N. T.*, p. 36, decisively rejects such views. This faith cannot be interpreted as "besondere emotionale Stellungnahme" (J. Wach) or as "psychische Disposition" (E. Fascher) . . . In ORIGEN, *De Principiis*, III, I, 15, we also find the idea of a certain coactivity of faith. He regards "the fact that the blind can see again, by virtue of the [fact] that they have asked [for it], in the belief that they could be healed, a work of the sufferers, but by reason of the restoration of their sight [the work] of our Saviour" . . . DE JONG, *Demonische Ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel*, says that the patient must be "in the right condition for successful treatment." "What he had to believe is scarcely indicated, perhaps the possibility of healing or something of the kind." But this faith is "the curative factor par excellence." In general Jesus' pupils did not further extend this salutary trend, but fell back on the old views. "In contrast with Jesus, who had shifted the main stress from medicine to the patient, healing again becomes the exclusive province of the healer and disease again becomes the proof of incorrect behaviour" (p. 101 f.).

Jesus performed through His own omnipotence, as a deed of compassion towards the suffering, as a miracle which He performed, at once and completely. It must therefore be stressed that there is not the slightest connection between the healings in the Gospels and the so-called faith cures.¹ The faith of the sick has nothing to do with suggestibility, with elevation of the soul above the flesh, with the effect of cosmic forces, influences from the world of spirits or the like, as a result of which a process of regeneration is put into effect. The accounts of healings speak of miracles, and not of mental processes or cosmic influences.

And yet faith was a prerequisite of healing.² Why? To answer this question we must consider two things, viz. the content and the intensity of the faith.

As regards the content, SEVENSTER believes that the faith of the sick must be interpreted as "a certain recognition of God in Jesus and confidence in him as the bringer of salvation."³ Doubtless some of

¹ Cf. RICHARDSON, *The Miracle-stories of the Gospels*, p. 63: "It should be abundantly clear that the stress upon faith in the healing miracles bears small relation to modern psychological examples of faith-healing." The modern concept of faith is something quite different, says Richardson. In the Gospels we are not concerned with so-called faith-cures. Cf. *Vragen rondom de gebedsgenezing*, p. 134 ff. Faith is no "therapeuticum."

² WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, *Religion and Medicine*, p. 352: "Wherever there is a detailed account of a healing wonder, the presence of faith is indicated." GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 67: "Der Glaube der Menschen, die um das Mächtigwerden seiner Kraft bitten, ist die unumgängliche Voraussetzung für das Geschehen der Krafttaten . . ." (cf. the same in TWNT, II, p. 303). KOHNSTAMM, *Schepper en Schepping*, III, p. 107; CAIRNS, *The Faith that Rebels*, p. 67. Cairns points out that the factor of faith in the healings was more or less suppressed in traditional views and still is in modern ones. JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 60 f.; FRIDRICHSEN, *Le Problème du Miracle*, p. 51: "La foi est la condition naturellement requise chez celui qui veut être guéri par la puissance surnaturelle de Jésus." MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 345, says that healing is "dependent on the faith of the sufferer," and, as he also assumes "confidence in his curative gift" in Jesus (see above), he arrives at the conclusion: "the faith must be mutual;" it is not a "one-sided process," see the failure at Nazareth. WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, devotes a chapter to "The nature and place of faith in healing," pp. 427-438. RIDDERBOS, *De komst van het Koninkrijk*, p. 114, points to the "interdependence" of miracles and faith. BIELER, *op. cit.*, p. 113, says of faith as a condition of miracles: "Ausgeprägt ist das, soweit ich sehe, nur in christlicher Literatur (der Begriff des Glaubens als Tugend und Verdienst ist ja dem klassischen Altertum so gut wie fremd); da nimmt er eine beherrschende Stelle ein. Vor allem muss der Wundertäter selbst an sich und seine Sache glauben."

³ SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, p. 36. Sevenster points to Mk. 6: 3; Mt. 6: 5-13. He also ascertains for instance in Mt. 9: 27-31 and 20: 29-31, in the invoking of Jesus as Son of David, a certain recognition of Jesus' Messianic activities.

the data mentioned by Sevenster point in this direction, but it must be borne in mind that there has been no mention of a clear knowledge of faith.¹ Likewise it will be difficult to deny the multitude any thoughts of magic. What seems important to us is the intensity of the faith, to which FRÖVIG has drawn attention. He is of the opinion that it was not a question of clearly defined knowledge of faith, but of: "the intensity of the confidence that was shown, and this [intensity] is what makes the faith great."² This intensity may not be confused with emotionality; it points in the direction of the absolute, of the will to self-surrender. As an example of this we may point to the question of Jesus to two blind men who begged Him for help: "Believe ye that I am able to do this,?" and their answer: "Yea, Lord," Mt. 9 : 28, 29. There firstly emerges from this the intense confidence of the sick, and secondly it indicates what is characteristic of the miracles of the New Testament, viz. the personal relation between Jesus and the sick.³ The stress falls on the personal, intense confidence that the sick had in Jesus. This confidence was aroused both by the preaching and by the deeds of Jesus. In both respects His activities "with authority" had been noted, Mk. 1 : 27; many eyes had been opened to God's redemptive action in His person. Where this was the case, faith had a "saving" effect. Faith related therefore to the whole of Jesus' activities in word and deed, and

¹ Cf. FRÖVIG, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu als Lehrer und Wundertäter*, p. 97. FILLION, *Les Miracles de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, II, p. 87. Jesus did not ask for a complete confession, but: "le bon Maître . . . se contentait souvent, pour opérer ses miracles, d'un humble degré de réceptivité." In the healing Jesus' will was the "facteur actif" and not the faith of the sick. See also MARXSEN, *Anfangsprobleme der Christologie*, p. 34 ff.

² FRÖVIG, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

³ GRUNDMANN, *TWNT*, II, p. 303: "Die Wunder haben zur Voraussetzung den Glauben des Täters und dessen, der das Wunder empfängt. Sie werden also in einer durchaus personalen Beziehung vollzogen." Cf. GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 68. Jesus binds men to His person. TÖDT, *Der Menschensohn in der synopt. Überlieferung*, p. 234, rightly comments with regard to Mt. 11 : 6 and Lk. 7 : 23 that what is demanded is: "nicht ein unpersönlicher Glaube auf Grund der Wunder—sondern eine Entscheidung an der Person Jesu. Am Heil hat nur der teil, der an Jesus keinen Anstoss nimmt; d.h. aber auch: an Jesus wird zum Sünder, wer ihm den Glauben verweigert." MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 133. In the New Testament faith is trust, confidence. "It is confidence in a person, and the person is God, the Father." MONDEN, *Het Wonder*. "The faith of which the Gospels speak in those circumstances proves not to be exclusively the faith in Christ's miraculous power itself, but surrender in faith to the whole of the divine mystery of salvation that acquires shape in his Person and in his redeeming deeds" (p. 104).

not only to His miraculous power, as BULTMANN, DIBELIUS and others believe.¹ When the faith of the sick is restricted to belief in miracles, this means an impermissible limitation, which brings us into the sphere of the pagan miracle-workers, and how is this belief in miracles to be linked up with the remission of sins bound up with healing? One of the striking differences between Jesus and the deity of Epidauros comes to the fore precisely on the point of faith. Aesculapius likewise demands that the sick shall have faith, but unconditional faith in his miraculous power, the proofs of which are abundantly described in the temple inscriptions. Anyone who doubts his power to heal is punished or pilloried in some other way.²

¹ BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 234 f. According to Bultmann the inner state of the healed persons is rarely mentioned. "Es versteht sich freilich von selbst, dass für die Krankenheilungen die πίστις derer, die um die Heilung bitten, Bedingung ist. Aber diese πίστις bedeutet nicht ein gläubiges Verhältnis zur Verkündigung Jesu oder zu seiner Persönlichkeit im modernen Sinne, sondern sie ist das Vertrauen zum Wundertäter, das man ihm schuldig ist . . . Da die πίστις die Anerkennung Jesu bedeutet, so fällt auf Jesus, dem sie gilt, nicht auf den Kranken, alles Licht." The healed persons are merely the object; they quickly disappear from the scene. The main issue is the glory of the miracle-worker. Cf. BULTMANN, *TWNT*, VI, p. 206: "Allgemein bezeichnet 'Glaube' bei den Synoptikern das Vertrauen zur wunderbaren göttlichen Hilfe, ja auch zur eigenen Wunderkraft; so auch bei Paulus (1 K. 12, 9; 13, 2)." Bultmann refers to Mk. 4 : 40; 9 : 23 f.; 11 : 22 f. and parallel passage; Mt. 17 : 20; Lk. 17 : 6. HELD, *Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch.* (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 266), calls this view "ein wenig ungenügend." DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 75 f.; WINDISCH, *RGG*, II, col. 1202; HAUCK, *Markus*, re Mk. 10 : 52: "Es ist hier wie 5, 34 als Vertrauen zu der in Jesus gegenwärtigen Wundermacht Gottes, nicht als Zustimmung zu seiner Messiaswürde gedacht." VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA, *Verklaring v.h. Ev. naar Matth.*, p. 252. The faith of those seeking healing is belief in the magic powers of Jesus. FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 94, opposes the views of Bultmann and Dibelius. BARTH, *K.D.*, IV, 2: "Jesu Wundertaten sind die irdisch-kosmischen Verwirklichungen seines Kerygmas und werden in diesem Zusammenhang getan, um die Menschen zum Glauben aufzurufen. Sie sind nicht selbständige, sondern in diesem doppelten Sinn—dem Wort und dem Aufruf zum Glauben—dienstbare Taten. Der Zusammenhang von Verkündigung, Wundertat und Glauben ist unzerreissbar; diese Dienstbarkeit des evangelischen Wunders ist unaufheblich" (p. 241).

² HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 9 ff., miracle 3. A man with paralysed fingers entered the temple. "Als er die Weihetafeln in dem Heiligtum sah, war er ungläubig gegen die Heilungen und machte sich über die Aufschriften lustig." Aesculapius healed him in a dream and then asked him: "ob er noch ungläubig sein wolle gegen die Aufschriften auf den Weihetafeln im Heiligtum; er habe nein gesagt. 'Weil du also vorher ungläubig gegen sie warst, die doch nicht unglaubhaft waren, so soll im Zukunft'—habe er gesagt—'dein Name 'Ungläubig' (Ἀπίστος) sein.'" Miracle 4. The one-eyed Ambrosia of Athens laughed at the healings. She was healed, but had to sacrifice a silver swine. Miracle 37. Cleimenes of Argos entered the temple paralysed. He dreamed that

The faith that Jesus asks is not only belief in His power — though He does ask that — but above all faith in who He is, in His coming and actions as the God-given Redeemer and Bringer of salvation. It is the surrender from person to person, from the helpless man to the helping "Lord," and for *that* reason it is the "saving" faith.¹

We have already spoken earlier about belief after the miracle, which was referred to above under (c).²

(d) *Miracles and prayer*

Although the subject-matter of this section is closely bound up with that of the preceding one, we prefer a separate treatment, since prayer is a special function of faith and has its own questions and problems. Two questions are of particular importance, viz. that of the relation between Jesus' life of prayer and His miracles and that of the connection between the prayers of mankind and the miraculous healings.

The praying of Jesus is referred to many times in the Gospels. From the beginning to the end of His life Jesus sought communion in prayer with the Father, especially in the case of important events. Luke in particular repeatedly states that Jesus retired to pray.³

the deity took him to a pond containing very cold water. "Als er sich feig benahm, habe Asklepios gesagt, er werde nicht *die* Menschen heilen, die dazu zu feig seien, sondern nur die, welche zu ihm in sein Heiligtum kommen in der guten Hoffnung (εὐέλπιδος), dass er einem solchen nicht Übles antun, sondern ihn gesund entlassen werde. Als er aufgewacht war, badete er und kam ohne Leibschaden heraus." Aesculapius thus hates cowardice; he wants complete confidence in his miraculous power. Not a word is said about a personal, deeper relation. Cf. also GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 68, and OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 210 f.

¹ Cf. the excellent comment by OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 211: "Der Glaube schliesst die Überzeugung von der Macht Gottes und Jesu ein, ist aber darüber hinaus ein persönliches Vertrauensverhältnis. Das Zutrauen zu der barmherzigen Liebe Gottes, demütige Ergebung, Gehorsam, Hingabe sind von ihm unabtrennbar. So besonders deutlich Mt. 8, 5 ff. Asklepios fordert den strikten Wunderglauben, Jesus lehnt ihn ab (J 4, 48)" . . . See also BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 263 ff. Barth speaks of the way which leads: "vom Wunder zum Glauben" and of that which leads: "vom Glauben zum Wunder." HELD, op. cit., pp. 263-284, has devoted an instructive chapter to: "Die Interpretation des Glaubens in den Wundergeschichten durch Matthäus." He distinguishes three aspects of the concept of faith in the Synoptic accounts of miracles, viz.: "den Sinn der Aktivität, des Wollens und des Bittens" (p. 271). In Matthew we find "Gebetsglaube."

² See: Function and Significance of Miracles in Jesus' Activities, "Miracles as a means of arousing faith."

³ Lk. 5 : 16; 9 : 18. See further Mt. 14 : 23; Mk. 1 : 35; 6 : 46; Lk. 3 : 21 (on the occasion of baptism); 6 : 12 (before the choice of the disciples); 11 : 1; 9 : 28-29 (before the transfiguration on the mountain); 22 : 32 (prayer for Simon and the other disciples); Lk. 22 : 39-46 and parallel passages (Gethsemane).

It is remarkable that nowhere in the Gospels is it said that Jesus prayed together with His disciples, i.e. as one of them.¹ True, He did pronounce a prayer or a blessing in their presence.² But our investigation is not concerned with Jesus' life of prayer in general. We are concerned with the following question: what importance, what value, had Jesus' prayers with regard to His miracles? Must the healings be regarded as the answers to prayers, or did Jesus, as the Son, act by virtue of His own power and authority? Now the strange thing is that the data in the Gospels point in both directions! It is stated on several occasions that Jesus prayed or looked up to Heaven. Mt. 14 : 19 and parallel passages state that Jesus looked up to Heaven and pronounced a blessing; in Mk. 7 : 34 it is said that Jesus looked up to Heaven and sighed, whilst Jn. 11 : 41 mentions the prayer of Jesus before the resuscitation of Lazarus. Perhaps Mt. 26 : 53, Mk. 9 : 29 and Jn. 2 : 4 also contain pointers in this direction. Besides these, we also find numerous data pointing to a personal power of Jesus. "I will, be thou clean," He said to the leper, Mk. 1 : 41. He addressed the paralytic with the words: "I say unto thee, Arise," Mk. 2 : 11. "Stretch forth thine hand," was the command to the man with the withered hand, Mk. 3 : 5. "Peace, be still" were the words He spoke to the sea, Mk. 4 : 39, etc.

Despite this double aspect, we find in many investigators a one-sided accentuation; they try to lay the stress exclusively on the answering of prayers. The raising of Lazarus from the dead is, to them, a particular example of the miracle as an answer to prayers.³ CAIRNS regards miracles as "the answers of God to the prayers of the Ideal Son."⁴

¹ GREEVEN, TWNT, II, p. 802: "Die Einzigartigkeit des Verhältnisses Jesu zu seinem Vater findet sich auch beim Gebet insofern bestätigt, als das Beten Jesu nie mit dem der Jünger zusammen genannt oder auf eine Stufe gestellt wird. Die einzige Ausnahme (J 4, 22) zeigt Jesus im Gespräch mit der Samariterin, wo er von der Anbetung der Juden und der Samaritaner spricht, *bevor* er seine eigentliche Würde zu erkennen gegeben hat." Cf. STAUFFER, Die Theologie des N.T., p. 262, note 343; SEVENSTER, De Christologie v.h. N.T., p. 28.

² Mt. 11 : 25; 14 : 19; 15 : 36; 26 : 27.

³ SCHLEIERMACHER, Das Leben Jesu, p. 233. According to Schleiermacher the resurrection of Lazarus is not a miracle of Christ. He prays: "da kommt Christus eigentlich ausser den Bereich des Wunders, ausgenommen die Festigkeit der Überzeugung dass das was er bat, auch von Gott geschehen werde, also diese Art von einer alle Analogie mit dem menschlichen übersteigenden Einwirkung fällt für Christum hier weg." BÜCHSEL, Theologie des N.T., p. 67: "Dies grösste Wunder soll nicht als eigene Leistung Jesu erscheinen; es ist Erhörung seines Gebets, Gottes Tat."

⁴ CAIRNS, The Faith that Rebels, p. 85: "The Gospel theory of the "miracles"

MICKLEM sees a fundamental connection between Jesus' power to heal and His life of prayer. His communion with God forms as it were the bridge over which the divine force reached the sick.¹

RUPPRECHT believes that we must assume Jesus' prayer also to be there where it is not mentioned,² whilst FIEBIG, who is of the opinion that the miracles were for preference interpreted by Jesus' contemporaries as answers to prayers, practises caution with regard to miracles in the New Testament.³ On this point SCHLATTER, too, deserves to be heard. He is of the opinion that in the matter of prayer there is a fundamental difference between Jesus and the rabbis. The rabbis namely taught that the prayers of those who were pleasing to God because of their righteousness — as for instance Hōni in the first half of the first century before Christ — were heard by God on account of their merit. Consequently such influential men of prayer were often called in to assist. SCHLATTER vigorously opposes the view that Jesus performed miracles in the capacity of a powerful man of prayer. No, says SCHLATTER, Jesus' deeds are vested in His mission, His kingly right and His Divine Sonship.⁴

of Jesus is that they are the answers of God to the prayers of the Ideal Son, the Man who is the supreme instance, in history, of Faith, Hope and Love; and they say with unambiguous plainness that that ideal Man invited His disciples to similar enterprises of faith, encouraging them to believe that in proportion to their faith would be the manifestation of God's order, the revelation of man's life as God meant it to be" . . . Cairns regards prayer as a force. "Prayer, as He conceives it, is much more than a waiting on God, in passive self-surrender to an inevitable will. The prayer of faith will assure its own fulfilment" (p. 81). In our opinion Cairns is following the dangerous tendency which we mentioned in connection with the view of faith as a coactive factor. The prayer of faith can "assure" nothing about the result; Cairn's view tends towards magic! . . . JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*, p. 47, also envisages the answering of prayers.

¹ MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 135: "This prayer-activity seems to have been essential to the success of the healing-ministry, and this fact may dispose us to believe that our Lord by His communion with God was mediating Divine power to His patients."

² RUPPRECHT, *Das Wunder in der Bibel*, p. 124: "So dürfen wir wohl auch von den andern Wundern Jesu, bei denen es nicht eigens gesagt wird, annehmen, dass er sie in betendem Glauben und gläubigem Gebet vollbracht hat."

³ FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 72: "Die Wunder erscheinen bei den Zeitgenossen Jesu vorzugsweise als Gebetserhörungen, als Taten Gottes. Dieser Gesichtspunkt ist auch im N.T. lebendig, hier begegnen jedoch auch Wundergeschichten, in denen von einem Gebet Jesu nicht ausdrücklich gesprochen wird."

⁴ SCHLATTER, *Das Wunder in der Synagoge*, p. 82: "Das sich aber Jesus als der bevorzugte Beter gewusst habe, der durch sein besonderes Verdienst Gott zu dem zu bewegen vermöge, wozu er sich sonst nicht bringen lasse, lehne ich als eine hässliche Fabel ab. Wer so redet, weiss nicht, was Jesus Glauben nennt."

On the grounds of the clear data in the Gospels it seems to us a limitation if the miracles of Jesus are classed as answers to prayers, and nothing more. The view of SEVENSTER, who says that the prayers of Jesus when He performs miracles imply that He did not act as a magician, hardly seems tenable, since in that case the prayers would have had a demonstrative nature.¹

We are confronted here with a paradox in Jesus' activities, a paradox which goes to the heart of Christology. As the Son becomes man He does everything in dependence on the Father, always praying to the Father, whilst at the same time "all things" have been delivered to Him by the Father, Mt. 11 : 27. But, although He submits to the will of God, He nevertheless acts "with authority" in word and deed. We therefore believe that the term "the answering of prayers" is not adequate, since it does not reproduce the actual state of affairs. When Jesus said "I will," "Arise," "Stretch forth," "Be still," He was commanding as the person of authority, whose right it was to speak thus, since in His kingly and saving action He was accomplishing God's decree in accordance with God's will, and in communion with the Father.

We now come to the second question. What connection is there between the prayers of mankind, in particular those of the sick, and miracles, i.e. the healing miracles? Jesus incessantly called upon His disciples and listeners to lead a life of prayer, giving them instructions on how to pray and pointing to the significance and the force of prayer.² Any need could be laid before God, under the promise: "whatsoever ye shall ask in prayer, believing, ye shall receive," Mt. 21 : 22. It is significant that Jesus said this immediately after His pronouncement on the ability of faith to move mountains. Now if we examine the pleas of the sick or of their helpers, we note that these prayers are extremely simple; they consist of only a few words, cries of distress, borne by the faith of the sufferers. Where these

Gerade für Männer wie Chanina ben Dosa hat Jesus Lukas 18, 11 und Matth. 6, 5 gesagt."

¹ SEVENSTER, *De Christologie* v.h. N.T., p. 34. Sevenster correctly remarks that prayer stresses "that Jesus can accomplish his work only in communion with the Father." Cf. BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, re Jn. 11 : 42.

² Mt. 6 : 5-15 (instructions); 7 : 7-12 (answering of prayers); 18 : 19, 20 (communal prayer); 21 : 22 (answering of prayers); 26 : 41 (vigilance); Lk. 11 : 5-8 (perseverance in prayer); 18 : 1-8 (perseverance); 21 : 36 (vigilance); Jn. 4 : 20-24 (worship in spirit and truth); 14 : 12-14 (answering of prayers); cf. 15 : 16; 16 : 23, 24, 26). Cf. the parallel passages.

prayers of the faithful were sincere, Jesus brought relief, whereas He radically rejected the requests of the Pharisees for startling miracles and signs.

Now may it be said on the strength of these data that prayer is a "way" of regaining health? We have avoided the much-used word "means," since it fosters incorrect associations, about which we shall have more to say shortly. The answer must be no as soon as only a little magic power or coercive character is attributed to prayer.¹ Then it becomes a self-acting "means!" The answer is yes to those who believe that God has the power to bring about changes in what man regards as immutable in the ordinary course of events, since His way is the way of will and love.²

HEIM has some instructive and profound things to say about the relation between miracles and prayer. The miracles of the Bible, says HEIM, are accessible only to a certain inner attitude, viz. that of man in prayer. "It is part of the essence of prayer that we have the certainty that the whole cosmos, from the ecliptic to the spinning electrons, lies at that moment in the hand of God like soft clay in the hand of the potter. He can do with it what He will. Whether the shape of the world alters or everything remains the same in itself, this is not the result of causal necessity, but because God wants it so. . . For man in prayer the cosmos is 'will', an internally operative will, a divine and a diabolical will. Now the miracle is the victory of God in this battle of spiritual forces. Every man who prays knows that this victory is possible at any moment and in any circumstances."³

¹ See MAHR, RGG, II, col. 901 ff. HEILER, *Das Gebet*, p. 89, recalls the continuous, tempestuous praying to persuade the deity to fulfil the wishes of the prayer. The Romans called this *fatigare deos*, tiring the gods. See Seneca, *Ep.* 31, 5; Horace, *Carm.*, I, 2; Tacitus, *Hist.*, I, 20 . . . CRESPIY, *La guérison par la foi*, p. 6, has rightly remarked that faith too is as such no medicine. "A proprement parler, la foi ne guérit jamais . . . Dans l'acte constitué par la guérison par la foi, la foi n'est pas l'agent de la guérison, elle est la bénéficiaire. Elle ne produit pas la guérison, elle la demande et la reçoit . . . Comme c'est à Dieu que la foi demande, de Dieu dépend la décision. C'est aussi pourquoi la foi ne saurait être considérée comme une puissance latente provoquant la mise en œuvre d'une puissance efficace, comme pourrait l'être, par exemple, l'incantation magique."

² VAN NIFTRIK, *Kleine Dogmatiek*, p. 258, points to Biblical references to both the mutability and the immutability of God. "Pleading the immutability of God's being, God's love and fidelity, we may pray for changes in God's deeds and expressions of will in this world and in our life. And so faith (Biblical belief in God) and prayer belong together."

³ HEIM, *Zur Frage der Wunderheilungen*, p. 423.

The last sentence from HEIM's striking argument — a sentence of which the content corresponds to what Jesus pledged regarding the prayers of the faithful — offers a starting point for a number of comments on healing through the power of prayer or faith healing respectively, divine healing or spiritual healing. Within the framework of our investigation these matters, which repeatedly cause feelings to run high, must be briefly discussed, since they form an exegesis of miracles in the New Testament for practical application. The strange thing is that believing Christians, who at heart would agree with HEIM's words, think and judge differently in concrete situations.¹ As the reader will be aware, this is particularly the case with prayer healing. Impressed by the healings of Jesus, by a number of Biblical texts, among which Jas. 5 : 14, 15 is cited again and again, and by the miraculous practices of the earliest Christians, movements have sprung up and continue to spring up which propagate the so-called forgotten matter of prayer healing, try to put it into effect and found healing centres. We may recall Bad Boll with the Blumhardts, Männedorf with Zeller, Teichwolframsdorf with Seitz, Möttlingen with Stanger, and the Emmanuel movement in Boston with Worcester, McComb and Coriat of earlier years. Of more recent date is, for instance, the healing work done by James Moore Hickson, who believed himself called to perform this special work by God and who toured the world from 1919 to 1924 to bring healing to suffering mankind. After the Second World War the evangelizing healers Hermann Zaiss and Osborn, among others, attracted much attention. WEATHERHEAD and CARADOG JONES state the names and activities of a number of church, inter-church and spiritual institutions and organizations active in faith and prayer healing. The principal ways and means used are personal and communal prayer, the adherence to fixed times for prayer, the laying on of hands and anointment.

We also encounter movements with a more or less religious tinge whose aim is to overcome suffering and disease through the power of the spirit. The most striking example of these is Christian Science,

¹ There are all kinds of factors which help to bring about this difference of insight: ecclesiastical, dogmatic, psychological, cultural, social. The Roman Catholic Church has always known and nourished belief in miracles, although development in the nineteenth century seriously undermined belief in the wonderful healings at the places of pilgrimage; see CARREL, *L'Homme, cet inconnu*, p. 174 f. In Protestantism the fundamentalistically, the pietistically oriented believer will be more receptive to prayer healing than the Christian of a matter-of-fact, critical turn of mind.

in which health through "prayer" is elevated to health through "thought," i.e. meditation on and absorption in the Divinity, as a result of which the spirit can triumph over the flesh and all fear of suffering and disease is said to disappear.¹

As we have already said, views differ greatly about these movements — we are now thinking solely of those from the Protestant side. Countless people view them sceptically, or at least most critically. We have already pointed out that every thought of prayer as "medicine" must be emphatically rejected. There is or ought to be a causal connection between therapeutical treatment and healing. Therapeutical treatment contains in itself healing power: it prevents, alleviates or heals disease. There is no causal connection between prayer and healing, i.e. prayer in itself has no power to heal; it is a supplication made in the belief that God is listening and can answer it. Christian prayer may never be mistaken for or confused with a psychical activity, a kind of psychotherapy, a concentration of mental powers or the idea of the transfer and radiation of forces with a therapeutical effect.

VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN seems to interpret prayer in the sense just described. According to him it can be seen as a radiation of forces of desire. Directed towards God it falls upon others, who are influenced by the powerful thoughts of those praying.² This view seems to us more telepathic than Biblical. A second objection relates to the great number of impressive "proofs" which prayer healing adduces. In every work on this subject reference is made to prayer healings not only of mental disturbances but also of the most dreaded somatic diseases, such as tuberculosis, plague, cancer,

¹ See among others LIEK, *Het wonder in de geneeskunde*. TENHAEFF, *Magnétiseurs, somnabules en gebedsgenezers*, Ch. VIII. CARADOG JONES, *Spiritual Healing*. WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*. Weatherhead discusses Christian Science at length, p. 160 ff. As regards Hickson, see p. 202 ff. The work of the "religious healing movements" is explained on p. 222 ff. Weatherhead is of the opinion that "the Church must be called back to the ministry of intercession for the sick . . . The doctors have done magnificent work, but they cannot do all the work" (p. 250 f.). FROST, *Christian Healing*, p. 357 ff., also advocates activity by the Church. "Christian healing has a real and reasonable place in the Church" (p. 357). Frost recalls that "there was a very real place for the healing of mind and body in the life and teachings of the Ante-Nicene Church" (p. 360). The Church must be "not a body of healers but a healing body" (p. 373). We are of the opinion—it is evident from our argument why—that the Church (the religious denominations) must refrain from any form of organization in this respect.

² VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *Parapsychologie en Godsdienstig leven*, p. 127.

heart disease, etc. Suspicion of these "proofs" is understandable. Irrespective of the nature and the degree of the diseases and the possibility of suggestion and autosuggestion which can give the patient a feeling of an improvement in his case, it must always be asked whether a healing or improvement of which the cause is hidden from the gaze and the knowledge of doctors may be called a "miracle." There is always the possibility that the cure was effected by an unknown but entirely natural process. Moreover, the problem of diagnosis is still relevant. The third objection which we should like to adduce is the question of faith, of the spiritual development which one must have achieved before one can participate in direct divine healing.

HOWARD COBB, for instance, considers the use of medicine dependent on the stage of spiritual development. But if we have not yet reached that stage, we cannot afford to do without it.¹ HOWARD COBB has great admiration for the medical profession; he finds medical means and skill doubtless gifts of God to suffering mankind, but not given to replace healing by faith in Christ.²

The answer to this view can be brief. Nowhere in the Gospels is anything said about a stage of spiritual growth on the ground of which Jesus brought healing.³ In a view such as that of Howard Cobb and others it seems as if a certain degree or depth of faith is favoured by a certain divine privilege. This idea of things must be described as simply absurd. It is unbecoming to try and gauge a person's spiritual growth by the fact of whether or not he is healed by prayer! The absence of healing can always then be attributed to something which has not yet been achieved.

¹ HOWARD COBB, *Christus de Geneesheer*, p. 99. Cf. p. 59, on divine help in the case of weak faith; however, the endeavour must be full faith! See also W. OURSLER, *The Healing Power of Faith*.

² HOWARD COBB, *op. cit.*, p. 104. . . . In recent years many works have been published on "prayer healing" in which the point of view adopted by the author is defended—usually in popular fashion—on "Biblical" grounds. There have also been works on this subject in which more cautious and more critical voices can be heard. NOLLE, *Arts en predikant*, p. 65 ff., considers it "by no means a coincidence that both psychosomatic medicine on the one hand and charlatanry and prayer healing on the other are flourishing. Psychosomatic medicine is a symptom of doctors' dissatisfaction with technicalized medicine. The other two are evidence of an identical dissatisfaction on the part of the patients with this method of treatment." Cf. p. 84, where Nolle speaks of a "pendulum movement." He rightly draws attention in the field of prayer healing and healing services to the "danger of an over-spiritual phase of reaction to a too materialistically oriented era."

³ See the preceding section on miracles and faith.

We have mentioned a number of objections which can be further supplemented in concrete cases. We believe that matter-of-fact, critical sense must oppose the reading of too much into certain texts, the adduction of "proofs" and organizing and controlling activities in a field which — if we may be permitted to say so — is so dangerous and impassable for man because, as the "field of miracles," it is in the fullest sense God's territory, the field of revelation of His will and grace!

Our criticism of the practice of prayer healing in no way implies that we deny the possibility of healing in answer to prayers. Criticism is all too often interpreted as "disbelief." Anyone who asserts that a miraculous healing of both mental and somatic ills is impossible denies the power, the love and the promise of God.¹ There have doubtless been men and women who have received "gifts of healing," 1 Co. 12 : 9.² Nor should the significance of intercession, especially for the sick, be underestimated.³ It is the task of every believer,

¹ See for instance Ps. 30 : 2, 3; 41 : 1-3; 50 : 15; 91 : 15; 103 : 3-4; Mt. 7 : 7; Jn. 16 : 23; Phil. 4 : 6; 1 Pe. 5 : 7. See ELZINGA, *Geloof en geneeskunde*, p. 78 ff. BARTH, K.D., II, 1, p. 574 ff. Part of the "freedom" of God is not only to hear the prayer of faith, but to answer it. "Man darf vor dem Ausdruck nicht zurückschrecken: es gibt auf Grund der Freiheit Gottes selbst eine Bestimmung Gottes durch das Gebet des Glaubens." BERKOUWER, *De Voorzienigheid Gods*, p. 268: "Anyone who truly thinks that he can say for certain that no miracles happen any more nowadays should in any case seriously ask himself whether he truly thinks that because of God's power over the world or because of a secret capitulation to 'determinism'." *Vragen rondom de gebedsgeneezing*, p. 125: "It is difficult to think that, out of the rich store of blessings which Christ daily brings to those that believe in him, the blessings for the body, in concrete cases healing of disease or the gift of healing, would now be suddenly excluded. We have warned sufficiently against over-rating. Perhaps it is more necessary to warn the community today against unbelievably paying no attention to these blessings." Cf. p. 199.

² BARTH, K.D., III, 4, p. 421, rightly points out that we know little about what this gift consisted in concreto. "Sicher ist nur, dass wir an eine in der Gemeinde als vorübergehende oder dauernde Auszeichnung einzelner ihrer Glieder wirk-same und bekannte Macht gegen die Krankheit zu denken haben: nicht diesen Menschen eigen, sondern als freies Geschenk Gottes ihnen zugewendet, aber nun doch durch diese Menschen ausgeübt. Man tut vielleicht gut, sie mit den Heilungen Jesu als den einzigartigen 'Zeichen und Wundern' des in ihm und nur in ihm auf die Erde gekommenen Reiches in nicht zu enge Beziehung zu setzen, sondern sie als eine Möglichkeit sekundärer Ordnung zu verstehen."

³ Jesus prayed that Simon's faith would not fail, Lk. 22 : 32. He prayed for His disciples, Jn. 17 : 9. Cf. Ro. 15 : 30; 2 Co. 1 : 11; Jas. 5 : 16: "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much." In the exegesis of James 5 : 14 it should be borne in mind that here no new and exclusive means is recommended to the elders. "James recommends it not as anything new, nor as excluding all other therapeutic methods" (ROPES, *St. James*, p. 304). The rabbis likewise visited

and when prayers are said without true belief in God's healing power and without hope that they will be answered, these prayers become empty words.¹ The immovable confidence of the person praying, of the sick person himself or of another, does not, however, imply that a miracle happens, but that God's will is done! The will of God is done just as much in the secrecy of the natural process of healing, in the furtherance of that process by medicine or assistance by an operation, in the granting of spiritual power and peace of mind, in a salutary trial such as Paul experienced, 2 Co. 12 : 7-10, as in the miracle of the direct, merciful intervention of His hand. And therefore our protest is directed so emphatically against the view of "full faith," the stage of spiritual development which is made a condition of divine healing. HIRSCH has made the significant comment: "Prayer and its answering are always the truth of God in secret."² This "secret" also holds good with regard to the relation between miracles and prayer. Hence, too, our objection to the spectacular element in the prayer meetings, healing services, etc., which are organized(!) — the question of the faith and the sincerity of the organizers is not the issue here — to pray for miracles and to make them public.³

the sick. ROPES points to among other things the pronouncement in Baba Bathra 116a: "Let him into whose house calamity or sickness has come, go to a wise man [i.e. a rabbi] that he may intercede for him with God" . . . See for Jas. 5 : 14 among others BORNKAMM, TWNT, VI, p. 664; CRESPIY, *La guérison par la foi*, p. 26 f.; NOLLE, *Arts en predikant*, p. 69 ff. BEER, *Exodus*, p. 35, calls Abraham and Moses "Gesundbeter" (see Gen. 20 : 17 and Nu. 12). As this word has a technical meaning, it can best be avoided.

¹ Cf. BARTH, K.D., III, 4, pp. 95-127, *Das Gebet*. WEATHERHEAD, op. cit., devotes a chapter to "The Practice of Intercession," pp. 236-251. He calls prayer "only one way of co-operating with God to bring health to men." Medical science, etc., are other ways. "Clearly no one can prove that prayer is the effective factor." But the same holds good for medicine. "The objection could always be sustained that the patient might have got better in any case" (p. 248).

² HIRSCH, RGG, II, art. Gebet, col. 897: "Falsch ist es, aus der Erfüllung von Bitt-gebeten, die man erfahren hat, etwas 'beweisen' zu wollen, sei es nun Gottes Dasein, sei es die eigene Begnadung durch Gott. Das Gebet und seine Erhörung ist stets die Wahrheit Gottes im Verborgenen."

³ See FABER, *Over ziek zijn*. Faber rightly says: "We have the impression that a certain longing for wonders easily invades the predilection for prayer healings" (p. 29). Faber's view of the problem of prayer healing amounts to the following. The two aspects of being ill, viz. "having a disease" and "being ill," were one and the same thing to the ancient consciousness. It was believed that disease was caused by an evil power, as a result of which one was "outside God's power." Now the healer had to free the patient from the grasp of the evil power and make him safe. This unity of the aspects has broken up for good in modern thought. Having a disease is for us a "natural phenomenon" (p. 28), which must be combated medically. The fact that we "are ill" means "that we shall pray that in this

We shall leave the results out of consideration, and we do not wish to say that healings and improvements during these meetings are impossibilities. Such a view could rightly be regarded as disbelief. The typical way in which movements such as these frequently flare into existence, enjoy an exaggerated prominence, suffer a relapse and disappear strengthens the conviction that such an exegesis of the miracles of the New Testament directed towards practical application in the mass is highly problematical. Owing to a certain familiarity with miracles, there is the danger that people forget the uniqueness of Jesus' miracles and the absolute singularity of miracles as deeds of God's omnipotent grace.

(e) *Miracles and the word*

We have already stated on a number of occasions our view that the miracles of Jesus must be regarded as independent functions of the Kingdom of God. The Miracle is a function sui generis alongside the word. This functional division between word and miracle in no way means an essential division, since they are both the revelation of God's rule. This division or subdivision becomes clear when it is properly realized what happens. The word, i.e. the proclamation of Jesus, is directed towards man in his total spiritual being, in which his physical being is also involved. In this word spoken with "authority" the Kingdom of God functions. Let us now consider miracles. In miracles, too, the word forms a very important factor; we shall come back to this in a moment. But Jesus also healed merely by laying His hands on and touching the patient. Contact with Jesus, in whatsoever form — remember the healing of the woman with an issue, Mt. 9 : 20-22 and parallel passages — brought immediate recovery to the sick. This means that a change occurred, mentally and somatically. In the nature miracles, too, a change occurred, in whatsoever fashion and in whatsoever substance. In concreto,

illness, too, we may preserve the correct relationship to God and that we may entrust everything to Him" (p. 208). Faber says that the pastor must not use prayer to find healing. "We are therefore, on the strength of a principle, opposed to the organizing of prayer healings; we believe that it is the physician's task to heal and that in our modern world the physician fulfils this part of Christ's mission" (p. 208). If a patient asks our advice about attending a service with prayer healing, we shall have to say that we can understand his trying this approach, but that prayer may not be used as a "magic means" of finding healing. "It may only mean that, through this service, the patient more easily finds the right relationship to God. If this includes his then becoming physically and mentally healthy as well, so much the better."

therefore, the distinction in the functioning emerges from the event as such and from the result of that event.

If this functional distinction is not recognized, one is soon tempted to try and weigh word and miracle against one another. The result of this is that in general priority is given to the word. The miracle is then mainly evaluated as a sign; all the weight is laid on the referential nature of the miracle. In this way it is, as it were, encapsulated in the proclamation. When SEVENSTER says: "The miracles thus refer every time to something that is much more important than the miracle in itself: the coming of the Kingdom of God," he is insufficiently alive to the function *sui generis* of the miracle.¹ The *hic et nunc* of the occurrence of the miracle is just as important as its referential function; the event is *causa efficiens* of the referential function. For the Kingdom of God becomes active, it enters the substance and renovates or changes. The fact that in this functioning at the time both Israel's prophecy of the expectation of salvation is fulfilled (retrospectively) and the coming of the Kingdom of God in glory is announced (prospectively), that in the healings "God's redeeming eschatological action" (Sevenster) is delineated, is something that comes to the fore in and through the happening of the miracle.

RIDDERBOS gives miracles a really secondary place. He points to the "only temporary significance" of Jesus' miracles and says that they "nowhere serve as an end, but always as a means in Jesus' activities and that they always remain subordinate to the preaching of the gospel." Characteristic of this view of miracles is the remark: "Nowhere in the Gospels do we see that they have an independent function free from the preaching of the gospel or transcending it."²

When opinions differ it is of the greatest importance that people try to understand each other's train of thought and world of concepts. If we have understood RIDDERBOS aright, "end" means something different to him than it does to us. Referring to Lk. 17: 17-19 — the

¹ G. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, p. 35.

² RIDDERBOS, *De komst van het Koninkrijk*, pp. 112-117. . . . BERKOUWER, *De Voorzienigheid Gods*, rightly does not wish to "confine miracles to symbols supplying or increasing knowledge." There are miracles in which the sign character comes strongly to the fore: "but", Berkouwer rightly adds, "on several occasions we see that God acts *in* the miraculous signs in the reality of His saving work" (p. 252). Cf. BAVINCK, *Geref. Dogmatiek I*, p. 361. Bavinck says that it is now realized that "prophecy and miracles are not simply appendages and evidence of revelation, but elements and essential constituents thereof."

nine lepers who did not give glory to God — and Mt. 7 : 22 — the defence which Jesus prophesies will be put forward by those who will appeal to the performance of healings and the doing of works in Jesus' name but who will still not be accepted — RIDDERBOS argues that miracles in themselves do not offer exemption from the last judgment nor entry into the Kingdom of Heaven, either to those who are the subject of the miracle or to those through whom the miracle is performed. However, here he confuses the function and the end of miracles with the concept of beatific grace. Nowhere at all in the Gospels is it stated that miracles as such granted those they healed eternal salvation. But this in no way means that miracles have as a result no purpose! End and means are both among the elementary traits of the concept of miracle. In a healing by Jesus the miracle had a salutary effect in that particular circumstance of man in need. It is precisely this that characterizes the independence of the function and the purpose of the deed as divine beneficence. Even in the case of the ten lepers!

RIDDERBOS says that the miracles of Jesus serve "solely as proof" of Jesus' power. Here he interprets a traditional view. Indeed, Jesus also shows His power in His miracles, but this is only one of the aspects of Jesus' miraculous power. We have written elsewhere at length about the various aspects.¹ We admit at once that the miracles do not have a function transcending the preaching of the gospel and that they cannot be detached from proclamation. We have already stressed the essential interconnection of the two in the revelation of the Kingdom of God. But the issue is the different way in which the Kingdom functions in the miracles than in the word, a difference in behaviour. We believe that this fundamental distinction must be maintained unabridged.

The view held by FRIEDRICH with regard to the relation between word and miracle is, in our opinion, equally unacceptable. He says that if the preaching is true proclamation, in which God acts, so that the rule of God becomes reality, then signs and miracles also happen. The miracle is not the most important thing, "but the message that works the miracle." The signs serve as "accompaniment" and "confirmation."² We should like to know what FRIEDRICH's opinion

¹ See the chapter: Function and Significance of Miracles in Jesus' Activities.

² FRIEDRICH, TWNT, III, p. 713: "Ist die Predigt wahre Verkündigung, in der Gott handelt, so dass die Gottesherrschaft Wirklichkeit wird, so geschehen auch Zeichen und Wunder. Es ist nicht so, dass die Wunder die neue Zeit herbei-

is of the "truth" of the preaching of the gospel during many centuries of Christianity, and also what he thinks of the occurrence of "miracles" in those centuries! The comparison between miracle and sacrament is also incorrect. For FRIEDRICH sees in miracles as signs a resemblance to the *verbum visibile*, the visible word, as we encounter it in the sacrament.¹

The inacceptability of the structure of this comparison becomes immediately apparent when we consider the two dissimilar data, which can only be compared with one another because each in its way has something in common with a third datum, i.e. the word. A wooden table and a wooden roof truss, for instance, have one essential element in common, the wood, but they are dissimilar things and differ in function. Miracle and sacrament have one essential element, the word, in common, but they are dissimilar things and differ in function. The sacrament was able to acquire form in the Church, owing to its nature and function, but miracles could not!

Whilst FRIEDRICH speaks of a resemblance between miracle and

führen, sondern Wunder geschehen, weil das wirkungskräftige Wort die Gottes-herrschaft ausgerufen hat, und in ihr ist alles heil und gesund. Darum ist nicht das Wunder das Wichtige, sondern die Botschaft, die das Wunder schafft. Die Zeichen begleiten das Wort und dienen nur zur Bestätigung des Verkündeten. Mk 16, 20 vgl. Hb 2, 3 f.; Ag 4, 29 f.; 14, 3." ALBERTZ, *Die Botschaft des NT*, II, 1, p. 73: The message may: "ganz ohne Wunder sein, und immer wieder, wenn das Wunder gefordert wird, dann wird nur die Botschaft gegeben. Die Botschaft steht also voran." GOGARTEN, *Die Verkündigung Jesu Christi*, p. 97: "Sicher ist aber auf jeden Fall, dass das Wunder der Verkündigung untergeordnet ist und nicht umgekehrt."

¹ FRIEDRICH, *op. cit.*, p. 713 f.: "Die Wunder sind als *σημεῖα* *verbum visibile* ähnlich wie die Sakramente. Wie es ohne das Wort kein Sakrament gibt, so auch kein Wunder ohne den Prediger von Gottes Tat." Cf. BERKOUWER, *De Voorzienigheid Gods*. Berkouwer rightly argues that the sacrament "never creates anything new;" it is sign and seal of the Word, but then he goes on: "In this progress from miraculous sign to sacrament lies the progress of God's work. It is not a transition from wealth to poverty, but from the wealth of salvation to greater wealth in the knowledge of faith and in the unction from the Holy One (1 Jn. 2 : 20)" (p. 266 f.). We do not understand this. The earliest Christianity states the occurrence of miracles alongside sacrament. If a miracle happens, does this then mean a "retrograde step" in God's work? Miracle and sacrament are different things, both in nature and in function. MÉNOUD, *La Signification du Miracle dans le Nouveau Testament*, p. 190 f., sees the sacraments not as: "successeurs, pour ainsi dire, des miracles . . . Bref, les miracles signifient que le royaume vient; les sacrements signifient que le Roi est déjà venu et qu'il demeure présent au milieu de ceux qui attendent encore l'arrivée du royaume . . . Le miracle et le sacrement sont ordonnés l'un à l'autre comme le sont le royaume et l'Eglise." See also CRESPEY, *La guérison par la foi*, p. 35 f.

sacrament, BARTH thinks that there is "probably" a "legitimate and undepreciated continuation and fulfilment" of miracles in baptism.¹ We cannot understand how Barth, even with the reservation which he himself makes, could have arrived at this idea. For it breaks down once and for all on numerous clear data in the Acts of the Apostles, in which baptism and miracle occur side by side in their completely independent nature. Miracles nowhere merged into or were replaced by the sacrament, neither in the writings of the New Testament nor in the tradition of the old Church. That the sacrament as such has the nature of a *mysterium* and a *mirabile* is a matter in itself, but the miracle as *miraculum* is a phenomenon *sui generis* in the order of salvation.

In KITTEL, too, we find opposition to the idea that "word and deed of Jesus disintegrate as two separate functions of His presence." He regards the word as "self-acting," i.e. as a "fundamental constituent" of action.² The latter point must be granted unconditionally to KITTEL on the strength of the data. Even a glance at the accounts of miracles makes it clear that the words which Jesus spoke before, during and after the performance of a miracle, in their imperative form and in their admonitory, encouraging and educational character, are extremely important.

In a minute investigation PERELS has laid down his findings and views on the relation between word and miracle in the work of Jesus. After having first devoted a chapter to the "mingling" of word and miracle in the synoptic tradition, he deals at length in a following chapter with the "side-by-sideness" of word and miracle.³ PERELS points out how now preaching, then healing comes to the fore,

¹ BARTH, K.D., II, 2. Barth believes that "healing" after the resurrection of Jesus no longer forms part of the mission of His Church. True, healings still happen, see Acts, but through Jesus' resurrection the victory over devil and death is accomplished. "Man muss im Blick auf Matth. 28, 18 f. wahrscheinlich sagen, dass das den Aposteln nach jener ersten Gestalt des Berichtes befohlene Heilen nachher in dem ihnen aufgetragenen *Taufen* in den Namen des dreieinigen Gottes seine legitime und vollwertige Fortsetzung und Erfüllung gefunden hat" (p. 497).

² KITTEL, TWNT, IV, p. 107.

³ PERELS, Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker, Ch. I: "Das Ineinander von Wort und Wunder," Ch. II: "Das Nebeneinander von Wort und Wunder." For the question of discussion and form of discussion in the accounts of healings see also ALBERTZ, Die synoptischen Streitgespräche, p. 119 ff. HELD, Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch. (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 22 ff.), points to the discussion as the "Mitte der Wundergeschichten." Word and response are for Matthew the main aspect of the miracle stories. He "thinks and writes" in the form of a discussion.

whilst sometimes they are mentioned side by side.¹ The effect on the people of both Jesus' words and His deeds is also portrayed in a strongly parallel fashion.² This parallelism is further to be found in the instructions to the disciples.³

Jesus thus operates through two gifts, according to PERELS, viz. through the word and through the miracle: the first proclaims that the Kingdom of God is nigh, the second shows its force.⁴ PERELS ends his study with the remark that word and miracle, although different in nature, as gifts of Christ both reveal His power.⁵

To sum up, we may say that both Word and Miracle must be interpreted as a revelation *sui generis* of the Kingdom of God. Their close interconnection is evident from the very great part that the word plays in the functioning of the Kingdom of God in miracles. In the activities of Jesus miracles were just as important from the functional point of view as the word, which is why the according of priority to the word must be regarded as incorrect. BARTH, believing that the proclamation of Jesus was the first and dominating aspect of His life's work, nevertheless considers it impossible that "the picture of his concrete action" should be regarded as being "of subordinate importance."⁶ Word and deed coincide; Jesus'

¹ Preaching only, see Mt. 4 : 17; Mk. 6 : 34; Mk. 10 : 1; Lk. 4 : 44. Healing only, see Mt. 8 : 16; 12 : 15; 14 : 14; 15 : 29-31; 19 : 1, 2; Lk. 13 : 32. Preaching and healing, see Mt. 4 : 23, 24; 9 : 35; Lk. 9 : 11.

² Effect of the word, see Lk. 4 : 14, 15; effect of word and miracle, see Lk. 5 : 15. Effect of miracle, see Mt. 9 : 26; Mk. 3 : 8; Lk. 7 : 17 . . . "Wie man Jesu Wirken in gleicher Weise als Wort und Wundertat ansah, zeigen besonders noch zwei Stellen: Luk. 6, 17 f. berichtet, dass die Leute zu ihm kamen, um ihn zu hören und sich heilen zu lassen." Cf. also Lk. 24 : 19. (PERELS, op. cit., p. 28).

³ Mt. 10 : 1; Mk. 3 : 14, 15; 6 : 12, 13; Lk. 9 : 1 ff.

⁴ PERELS, op. cit., p. 28: "Wie das Wort die Nähe des Gottesreichs verkündigt, so ist es im Wunder wirkungskräftig geworden."

⁵ PERELS, op. cit., p. 108: "In der alten Zeit und auch in unseren Evangelien haben wir trotz des vollen Bewusstseins von dem Unterschied zwischen Wort und Wunder und Wahrung ihrer Eigenart doch die Verkündigung beider als der Gaben des Christus, die seine Vollmacht offenbar machen." MENOUD, *La Signification du Miracle dans le Nouveau Testament*, p. 185, says of the relation between word and miracle: "Ce sont deux moyens de révélation qui s'appuient l'un l'autre pour ainsi dire: la parole rappelle que la valeur du miracle n'est pas dans sa forme, mais dans son contenu, et ce contenu, c'est l'annonce de la rédemption. D'autre part, le miracle rappelle que cette parole de salut n'est pas une simple parole vide et vaine, mais une parole-énergie, une parole-acte, la parole de Celui pour lequel dire et faire sont un."

⁶ K. BARTH, K.D., IV, 2. Barth speaks of the "Lebenstat Jesu." This *Lebenstat* was "sein Wort" (p. 215). In His action: "der andere Aspekt der *Lebenstat* Jesu" is manifest. "Es ist wahr, dass wir es, wenn von seinem Ausrichten der frohen

action was "something like the shining light of his speech."¹

Where Jesus' word was not believed there was just as little salvation as where His miracles were not believed. As such, the healings of Jesus did not serve as assurances and guarantees of eternal salvation.² In the healings the redeeming action of God among men, in their situation and in their concrete need, became public; the love of God was crystallized.

(f) *Miracles and salvation*

Miracles naturally play an important part in systematic theological thought. However, dogma is faced with the difficulty of accommo-

Botschaft, von seiner Lehre, von seiner Verkündigung berichtet wird, mit *dem* Aspekt seiner Lebensstat zu tun haben, der in der Sicht aller vier Evangelien der *erste*, der *beherrschende* war. Es wäre aber unmöglich, diesen zweiten, das Bild seines konkreten Handelns, als nebensächlich, als untergeordnet anzusehen: als einen Zug, der nur beiläufig zu beachten wäre, zur Not auch übersehen werden könnte" (p. 232).

¹ Op. cit., p. 232: "Sein Handeln war nämlich so etwas wie das leuchtende Licht seines Redens, man könnte sagen: das in die *Wirklichkeit* hineinleuchtende Licht der *Wahrheit* seines Redens. Sein Handeln ist, sachlich gesagt: der Erweis jener Koinzidenz, ja Identität seiner *Verkündigung* des Reiches, der Machts-ergreifung der Herrschaft Gottes mit diesem *Geschehen* selbst und als solchem." Cf. K.D., I, 1, p. 420 f. on the "Ineinander von Wort und Tat" . . . MICHAELIS, TWNT, V, p. 348: "Dass man von Anfang an nicht nur die Worte Jesu überliefert hat, sondern auch seine Taten, hängt wohl damit zusammen, dass Wort und Werk und somit Hören und Sehen die volle Geschichtlichkeit und die Ganzheit des Offenbarungsgeschehens ausmachen. An sich freilich ist ein Übergewicht des Hörens nicht zu verkennen: οἱ ἀκούσαντες Hb 2, 3 als Entsprechung zu οἱ αὐτόπται Lk 1, 2 ist durchaus symptomatisch. Das Sehen ist selbst auch eine Art Hören, nämlich ein Aufnehmen der Offenbarung: es kann und soll wie das Hören zum Glauben führen J 11, 40; 20, 8." The comment by Hess, Geschichte der drey letzten Lebensjahre Jesu, II, p. XXXI f., still deserves full attention. If, according to Hess, the purpose of a written work can be derived from its contents and its lay-out, then, from the very fact that the actual doctrine is only part of the Gospel and the deeds and the vicissitudes of the Saviour just as large a part, or an even larger one, of the Gospel, it may with justice be concluded that the issue is not only the doctrine, "sondern unsre Meynung ist diese: nach einer etlichjährigen Bekanntschaft mit der evangelischen Geschichte, halten wir es für eine ausgemachte Sache: Dass die *Handlungen* und die *Schicksale* Jesu einen eben so *wesentlichen* Theil der Evangelien als immer seine Lehre ausmachen, und dass es eben auch eigentlich darum zu thun gewesen, uns mit *diesen* bekannt zu machen." Hess is opposed to the view that morality is the only doctrine that may be learned from the story of the Gospel "heut zu Tage" (Hess' work was first published in 1774).

² A typical example of this is offered by the healing of the man born blind; in whom "the works of God" should be made manifest, Jn. 9. At first the healing is altogether of the nature of a sign. Only after a dispute with the Pharisees does the healed man, in a discussion with Jesus as his "benefactor" (verses 35-39), arrive at faith in Jesus as his "Lord!"

dating miracles in one limited field. As miracles can be regarded from various points of view, it is impossible to "pigeonhole" them. If miracles are seen as the revelation of God's Power and Will, their place is in the dogma of the Essence of God and, in connection therewith, in that of the Creation and Providence. If miracles are regarded from the point of view of divine mercy, they find their place in the doctrine of Redemption, Atonement and Re-creation. In view of their referential nature, they are also relevant to dogmatic thought on the End of the World and the Last Judgment.

Not a single one of these facets may be lost from sight. The miracles of Jesus are not only "proof and confirmation" of His power; they are not only a display of love; they are not only signs. In view of their complex nature, miracles will therefore have to appear in various places in dogma and must be regarded in relation to the theme dealt with in that place.

It is true that miracles are a revelation of divine power, but they are not directed towards a display of power. For a miracle is never an end in itself, since in that case it could only arouse "wonder." To Israel the whole glory of creation was proof and sign of divine revelation. Now this revelation of power, both in the usual order of nature and in the special deeds of God, was to Israel implicit revelation of salvation, i.e. the announcement of God's goodness and the gift of His benefactions. In a meaningful section BARTH has described God's "Creation as benefaction."

God's creative act entails His affirmation of the creation. "Divine creation is divine benefaction. What is given form thereby is the goodness of God."¹ This creative deed of God is the realization and the justification of His creature.² In this work of creation and providence miracles also have their place; they are the element unexpected by man and, within the framework of the established order, the unforeseen and incomprehensible revelation of God's will.

To understand Biblical miracles properly, it must always be borne

¹ K. BARTH, K.D., III, 1, p. 378: "Gottes Schaffen schliesst nämlich in sich Gottes Ja zu dem von ihm Geschaffenen. Göttliches Schaffen ist göttliche Wohltat. Was in ihm Gestalt gewinnt, das ist die Güte Gottes. Das ist sein Charakter, ohne den es nicht dieses Gotteswerk wäre."

² III, 1, p. 389: "Der Charakter des göttlichen Schaffens besteht sachlich . . . darin, dass, was Gott schaffen wollte und geschaffen hat, sein und gut sein darf: Gottes Schaffen ist Verwirklichung und Rechtfertigung seines Geschöpfes. Darin ist es Wohltat."

in mind that they are not directed towards an interruption in the natural order, but that they entail a change in the natural order. This change, which appears to man as "contra naturam," is nothing more than a way by which God brings salvation to man.

This change is a *via salutis*, a way of salvation of an entirely individual nature; it is another action of God! Now as this is so, theological thought on miracles may not narrow into a "disputation" with scientific thought, but must culminate in the Biblical theological understanding of miracles as the revelation of God's salutary power of love. For it is in this that the deepest significance of miracles lies.

We have just said that Biblical theological thought may not narrow into a disputation; nor may it ignore the kernel of the disputation, however. We believe that the traces of this are to be found in BERKOUWER. When he says that in miracles "it is not miracles and nature that [collide], but the Kingdom of God and guilt, the Kingdom of God and the realm of darkness," this pronouncement must be regarded as only partly correct.¹ It is in fact correct that in the healing miracles of Jesus the Kingdom of God "collides" with the realm of darkness, but it is just as real and true — and this reality may never be evaded — that for human thought, knowledge and experience another "collision" is concerned. Dogmatic thought may never omit from its reasoning the empirical reality, the empirical knowledge! Although DIEMER has opposed an orthodox Protestant view of miracles as occurring "above and against nature," and has reproached the proponents of this view with having "surrendered" to a "rationalistic view of nature," with a superstructure of "supranaturalism," surely nobody can maintain that there is no gulf unbridgeable by human thought between normal, empirical events and what happens in a miracle! In a rationalistic view of nature rational thought is the ultimate determinant; in an empirical view of nature, on the other hand, one can in faith recognize both the ordinary and the extraordinary as ways of divine revelation. After DIEMER has argued that nothing against nature happens in the signs and miracles, but that

¹ BERKOUWER, *De Voorzienigheid Gods*, p. 254 . . . Cf. DIEMER, *Natuur en Wonder*, Phil. Reformata 1943, p. 116 f. There is no question of special divine intervention in natural events. "God intervened in an entirely different sense, viz. by checking the process of disintegration of sin. The disruptive effect of sin is eliminated in Christ in the central miracle of re-creation after the Fall, so that in Him the forces and faculties can again be deployed normally, i.e. in accordance with the original instructions."

the so-called laws of nature are "functional relations that express the connection between certain groups of natural functions," he goes on to say that these relations may be ushered within the created structures by higher functions, thus unfolding the possibilities and forces in the created. "They are moreover directed, and may therefore also be led and governed by the coming Kingdom of God, and this happens in the case of 'signs and miracles.' When this happens, no laws are suspended or abolished; the laws are instead directed towards a higher end, by virtue of the original obedience of the created to the Creator."¹ The mistake in DIEMER's reasoning is in our opinion that he forgets that the final element, i.e. the direction towards a higher end, is inseparably bound up with the causal element, viz. the occurrence of a change — it does not matter how, in what and to what — in the regularity of empirical natural events which has been created and is maintained by God, and in which we after all live. Moreover, a certain danger lurks in the idea of "directed towards a higher end," since the subsidiary idea can easily creep in of a process, an evolution and an unfolding of what is present, whilst the very characteristic of miracles is the abrupt end of a status quo, an immediate change, a break in the existing state of affairs, i.e. the occurrence of a new and inexplicable situation.

We considered it necessary to dwell for a while on the above view, since it is evident that too much stress on one thing easily leads to neglect of the other. Consequently, when BERKOUWER says that in the New Testament "the miraculous power of the Kingdom [is] not directed 'contra naturam,' but 'contra peccatum' and against the appalling consequences of sin," one must keep very clearly in mind the fact that the concept "against sin" is an entirely religious one, whereas "against nature" must be understood in the light of empirical natural events.² Naturally one can best speak of a "contra peccatum" in the case of the healing miracles; but this cannot be simply applied to the nature miracles.

After these remarks on miracles in connection with the creation and the natural order, we shall consider miracles in the framework of the dogma of divine mercy, of atonement. BARTH, speaking of the work of "God the Atoner," has strikingly said that it is God's essential will to destine man for salvation.³ In miracles God's power

¹ DIEMER, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

² BERKOUWER, *op. cit.*, p. 254. Cf. the chapter: Miracles and Science.

³ K. BARTH, K.D., IV, 1. "Es ist die Bestimmung des Heils für den Menschen

and His love come as it were hand in hand to man to bring him salvation. BERKOUWER believes that the meaning of miracles is to be found in the Kingdom of Atonement. It draws attention to the message of reconciliation.¹ A miracle is always the work of God's grace, through which He brings salvation and redemption, but in which He also wishes to rebuke and warn man. Once Israel was redeemed from Egypt by the saving hand of God. The sick were torn by Jesus from the grasp of their diseases, the resuscitated were released from the power of death, the miraculously fed were liberated from the torments of hunger, the disciples were freed from their fear by Jesus' command to the natural elements. To this extent it is therefore correct to speak of God's redemptive action in miracles. However, we should like to point out that this does not give expression to the entire significance of miracles. And added to this is the fact that the concept of atonement as such is interpreted in different ways. It would be beyond the scope of our subject to go into dogmatic thought on atonement; we shall merely make a few comments. In the first place the concepts of atonement and redemption, however closely they may be related, must be distinguished from one another. In redemption we are concerned with release from a state of imprisonment, liberation from the power of an enemy, and also buying off and ransoming oneself from a state of guilt.² In the concept of

und des Menschen für das Heil Gottes Ur- und Grundwille, der Sinn und Grund seines Schöpferwillens" (p. 8). Cf. K.D., II, 1, on "Gottes Vollkommenheiten." "Gottes Wesen ist dies: der in Freiheit Liebende zu sein" (p. 362) . . . From this "love in freedom" miracles also spring. DE GROOT-HULST, *Macht en Wil*, points to God's thought and care for man, cf. Ps. 40 : 17. "Here it is clearly formulated: God's 'thought' is not simply being mindful of, having in mind, but it is at the same time helping and redeeming" (p. 31).

¹ Op. cit., p. 258: "The significance of miracles lies in the Kingdom of reconciliation and directs the gaze to the message of reconciliation, which, without faith and surrender, can never be understood." Cf. p. 265.

² See among other places Ps. 102 : 20 (פתח, open); 105 : 20 (פתח and נתר); 146 : 7 (נחל, loose); Isa. 14 : 17 (פתח); Jer. 40 : 4 (פתח). Lk. 1 : 68 and 2 : 38 speak of the redemption (λύτρωσις) of Israel from the power of the enemy. Cf. 24 : 21. See PROCKSCH, *TWNT*, IV, p. 329 ff. and BÜCHSEL, *TWNT*, IV, p. 337 ff. . . . VON SODEN, *RGG*, II, col. 275: "Der Begriff der Erlösung umfasst als seine Voraussetzung den Gedanken einer Gefangenschaft, aus der Befreiung nur durch fremde Hilfe, nicht durch eigenes Vermögen möglich ist; das zu Erlösende wird als ohnmächtig in der Hand einer fremden und feindlichen Macht gedacht, die durch die Übermacht des Erlösenden gebrochen wird." SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, after investigating the concept λύτρον, concludes that: "λύτρον relates to a ransom paid for liberation from a state of debt, slavery or imprisonment" (p. 113). STAUFFER, *Theologie des N.T.*, p. 127 ff.

atonement the idea of guilt comes more strongly to the fore; the reconciliation restores the peace disturbed by guilt.¹ If it is assumed, as Aulén and Heim do, that the work of Christ consisted in His victory over sin, death and the devil, the concepts of redemption and atonement coincide.² However, besides this view of atonement other opinions occur, so that a person applying systematic theological thought and marshalling of data is confronted with a number of questions if he tries to relate miracles solely to the field of God's atoning action. Our following objection concerns the danger of too narrow an outlook, a danger that is present in every attempt at systematic classification. We have already pointed out at the beginning of this section that miracles belong in more than one dogma. It may be said that they as it were "play" through the whole doctrine of Christianity.

That is why we established a link between "Miracles and salvation" in the heading to this section. For then miracles are given the greatest

¹ VON SODEN, RGG, V, col. 1564 f.

² See KORFF, *Christologie*, II, p. 66 ff. Korff describes the characteristic feature of this theory as follows: "The significance of Christ's work is found here in an objective change brought about by Him in the state of the world. The world is liberated by Him from the rule of the evil power (or powers) and won over again to God" (p. 68). Cf. BERKOUWER, *Het werk van Christus*, p. 364 ff. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, says that Jesus' work may be characterized first and foremost as a "liberation from the power of Satan. Much of the content of the whole New Testament, and certainly of that of the Synoptic Gospels, may be described as a struggle against the Prince of evil spirits" (p. 108). HEMPEL, *Heilung als Symbol u. Wirklichkeit im bibl. Schrifttum*, p. 298 f., says that a comparison with the Qumran texts clearly shows that the Judaism of those days had to make a stand against Satan and his host of demons. He goes on: "Und hier gewinnt nun die Legitimierung Jesu durch das Heilungswunder in den Erzählungen ihre charakteristische Form. Es geht da nicht nur um die Abweisung der pharisäischen Anklage der Dämonenaustreibung durch den Beelzebub (Matth. 12, 24 ff. par.), sondern um etwas tiefer Liegendes: In der Heilung, vor allem derer, in denen als den 'Besessenen' für ihre Zeit die satanische Wirklichkeit an die Oberfläche drängt, tritt Jesus als der auf, in dem 'die Königsherrschaft Gottes zu euch gekommen ist' (Matth. 12, 28)." See also BETZ, *Jesu heiliger Krieg*. Betz compares the so-called "Kriegsrolle" of the Qumran texts with the Synoptic data regarding the "holy war" waged by Jesus. The miracles of Jesus indicate inter alia that Jesus did not wage a political struggle with "die Starken," but fought against "den Starken" (see Lk. 4 : 13). "Er sucht ihm jetzt schon seine Beute abzugeben. Die Sünder, die Besessenen, die Kranken, sind nicht Jesu Gegner, sondern die Gefangenen Belials; ihnen bringt er nicht neue Ketten, sondern die Freiheit. Jesus verbindet (vgl. Lk IV 18 nach Is LXI ff.) die Aufgabe des heiligen Krieges mit der des heiligen, priesterlichen Dienstes der Endzeit. Beide Motive beherrschen das Leben auch der Qumransekte, ihr gegenüber weicht Jesu Auffassung in anderer Weise ab" (p. 134). For Jesus did not withdraw into isolation, but entered Jerusalem and cleansed the temple.

possible latitude as revelation of God's Power, Will and Love. The concept "salvation" as the "peace" brought about by God's grace contains every aspect that manifests itself in miracles: creation and providence, forgiveness and atonement, re-creation and promise.

We therefore believe that in our definition of Jesus' miracle as a salutary function of the Kingdom of God the most effective expression is given to the New Testament witness of miracles.

IV. JESUS' ACTIVITIES AS HEALER

One often reads or hears it said that Jesus was a "doctor," indeed that He was the "greatest doctor" that the world has ever known. Expressions such as these are understandable, particularly in the light of Mt. 9 : 12, 13 and parallel passages, in which Jesus speaks of physician and sick, but from the technical point of view they are incorrect. Jesus was not a "doctor," but a "Healer."

We have already pointed out on several occasions that the gift of healing was ascribed to all kinds of "divine men," but that there is a fundamental difference between these miracle-workers and Jesus.

The healings performed by Jesus reveal that every healing is at bottom God's work; it is a display of divine mercy. This is referred to repeatedly in the Old Testament. Now the question is: is it merely this idea, this "thread" running through the Old Testament, that we see present in Jesus' work of salvation, or can we also perceive that Jesus assumed the functions of certain persons in the Old Testament? We could then think of the figures of the physician, the priest, the king and the prophet. The Old Testament emphatically proclaims that God is the sole and the great Healer.¹ The truth of this proclamation can be accepted only by faith. But this causes difficulties and tensions for empirical life, for this truth can also not be believed, or can be believed only in part. Man's desire, will and ability to contribute in his own way towards preserving and improving his health,

¹ See among other places Gen. 20 : 17 (God healed Abimelech in answer to Abraham's prayer); Deu. 28 : 27, 35 (God does not permit healing); 2 Ki. 5 (the healing of Naaman); 2 Ki. 20 : 1-11 (Hezekiah's sickness and healing; cf. Isa. 38 : 1-8). An important text is Ex. 15 : 26: "for I am the Lord that healeth thee." Cf. Deu. 32 : 39 and Nu. 21 : 4-9. BEER, Exodus, comments on Ex. 15 : 26: "Wie Religion und Recht wird auch die Heilkunde auf Jahwe zurückgeführt — ein wertvoller Gedanke! Denn so ist einer Zersplitterung seines Wesens vorgebeugt (Deut. 6, 4) und dem Glauben an besondere Schutzgötter der einzelnen Kulturgebiete die Unterlage entzogen." . . . Cf. also Jesus Sirach 38: 1-15 and the prayers for healing in Ps. 6 : 2; 103 : 3 . . . Hebrew has three verbs for "to heal": *גָּדַל* (root meaning: remove); *חָבַשׁ* (root meaning: tie) and *רָפָא*. For a further explanation see BRONGERS, Enkele opmerkingen over het verband tussen zonde en ziekte etc., p. 135 ff. In the New Testament the verbs chiefly used are *ἰάομαι* (26 times) and *θεραπεύω* (38 times). Healing is further indicated by the word *ὑγιής* in various compound forms, by *σῶζω* and by a number of descriptions: *χομψότερον* (amend, Jn. 4 : 52); *οἱ ἰσχύοντες* (they that be whole, Mt. 9 : 12) and *ἐγείρω* (raise up, Jas. 5 : 15). See KOOLE, Gaven der geneezing, p. 7 ff.

towards offering resistance to disease, were just as active in Israel as in other peoples.

We do not intend to lose ourselves in speculations on the extremely complicated theological problem which this involves, with its many facets regarding the relation of God to man and of man to God, but we shall place on record the fact that, according as medicine developed, tensions occurred between belief in the way of God with man and the use of human means. In the chapter "Miracles and Medicine" and the section on "Miracles and prayer," we have discussed at length these stresses and conflicts, together with the problem of faith which is inherent in them. Some striking examples have been preserved for us in the Old Testament.¹

The Old Testament does not furnish any exact information on the profession and practice of physician. The first reference to "physicians" is in Gen. 50 : 2. They were Egyptian slaves of Joseph, who had to embalm the body of his father.²

It is remarkable that in the extensive instructions concerning leprosy, Lev. 13 and 14, not a word is said about the function of the physician; the function of the priest is discussed instead. The disease

¹ See 2 Ki. 1 : 2 (Ahaziah wanted to consult Baal-zebub, the god of Ekron, about his disease); 2 Ch. 16 : 12 ("yet in his disease" Asa did not seek aid from God, but from the physicians). RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher*, makes the following comment on this text: "Man wird bei diesem Tadel in Rechnung stellen müssen, dass sich die damaligen Heilpraktiker nicht selten der Beschwörungen und anderer magischer Künste bedienten." HEMPEL, *Heilung als Symbol u. Wirklichkeit im bibl. Schrifttum*, says that as God is the sole Saviour it is also consistent: "wenn sich das Heilungsmonopol Jahves auch gegen die Ärzte als solche richtet, wenigstens im heutigen Text von II Chron. 16, 12" (p. 284). In the Old Testament we hear nothing about "Heroisierung" of physicians (p. 285). OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 201, rightly says that the relation between the creative power of Jahweh and human science entails difficulties: "wie man sie auf ausserbiblischem Boden kaum irgendwo so stark empfunden hat. Aus dem aut-aut wird aber mehr und mehr ein et-et mit Akzentuierung der zuletzt all-wirksamen Macht Jahwes."

² PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 18 ff. In the chapter "Der Arzt und das übrige Heilpersonal," pp. 10-43, Preuss states in detail what is known about the physician and his work from the Bible and Jewish literature. Cf. JAKOBOVITS, *Jewish Medical Ethics*, pp. 201-243 . . . The physicians in Gen. 50 : 2 are called אֲפִי, doctor. Specialists were unknown. The physician was at the same time his own apothecary. Nor were there apothecaries in Egypt, but there were specialists in all kinds of diseases, see SIGERIST, *A History of Medicine*, p. 319 ff., HERODOTUS, *Hist.*, II, 84: *μῆς νόσου ἕκαστος ἰητρὸς ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ πλεόνων*. RIVERS, *Medicine, Magic and Religion*, p. 46, tells of the occurrence of medical specialists on Eddystone Island: "although in each case the cure of disease is intimately associated with certain religious functions." See also OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 200 ff. HEMPEL, *op. cit.*, remarks that the old Israelitic physician was in the first place a "Verbinder, Wundarzt" (p. 240 f.).

is regarded exclusively from the point of view of the cult. PREUSS is of the opinion that, although the priest in Israel might have possessed some medical knowledge — as is the case in other peoples — he was nevertheless not a physician in the ordinary sense of the word.¹

The same applies to the kings. Solomon was in later times credited with enormous medical knowledge, but nowhere in the Old Testament is there anything about the practice of medicine by the kings.²

This is not the case as regards the prophets, although it must be borne in mind that they, too, were not physicians in the technical sense of the word.

PREUSS believes that many prophets doubtless possessed both medical and scientific knowledge; remember Elisha and Isaiah. The prophets were never called "physicians," although the name *rophē* (physician) was already known by then.³

Given the general level at which scientific knowledge stood in Antiquity, and having regard to the merging of rational thought and metaphysical and religious speculations, it is understandable that

¹ PREUSS, op. cit.: "Von einer *curandi methodus sacerdotum* findet sich kein Wort, der Priester erklärt nur für rein oder unrein und sieht, 'ob der Aussatz geheilt ist von dem Aussätzigen' (Lev. 14, 4). Nirgends zeigt sich von einem therapeutischen Rat, den der Priester erteilt hätte, auch nur die geringste Andeutung. Die Stellung des Priesters im jüdischen Altertum ist am ehesten mit der des heutigen englischen Gesundheitsbeamten (*officer of health*) zu vergleichen" (p. 18 f.). OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 201, says that the priest had the function of "Gesundheitspolizei." Cf. HEMPEL, op. cit., p. 293 ff. In Jesus' day, too, no "priesterliche Heilungswunder" took place (p. 295).

² For Solomon, see FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, VIII, II, 5. PREUSS, op. cit., p. 19. The view that all the rulers of Israel were *medendi artis periti*, as held by S. Cohn, *De medicina Talmudica*, 1846, hangs completely in the air . . . "Die alten Bibliographien verzeichnen eine grosse Reihe von Schriften medizinischen Inhalts, die sogar bis auf die Urväter des Menschengeschlechts zurückgeführt werden. Sollen doch von Sem, dem Sohne Noahs, in der Mainzer bischöflichen Bibliothek *ampli de Medicina Commentarii* vorhanden sein!" HEMPEL, op. cit., p. 292 f.

³ PREUSS, op. cit., p. 19 . . . It is very questionable whether the improvement of the drinking water in the spring at Jericho by Elisha, 2 Ki. 2 : 19-22, was the product of Elisha's "scientific knowledge." The use of salt must rather be seen in the light of ancient religious notions, cf. HAUCK, TWNT, I, p. 229 . . . As regards the occurrence of the term *רֹפֵא*, cf. the remark by CURTIS, *Chronicles*, re 2 Ch. 16:12: "The art of healing seems to have been practised by the prophets . . . Possibly this passage reflects the activity of physicians in the Chronicler's own time." Cf. BEER, *Exodus*, p. 34 f., on Moses as a miracle-worker. "Wie Jesu werden Mose Heilwunder nachgerühmt. Es liegt kein Grund vor, Mose medizinisches Können und Wissen im Rahmen der Antike abzuspochen."

for the then "doctors" the dividing line between actual medical treatment and magical practices was often non-existent.¹

Considering the above data, we may say that, as regards the personal element, we find in the activities of Jesus as Healer solely the figure of the Old Testament prophet. The people consequently see Jesus as the prophet/healer; they are of the opinion that Jesus was "Elias" or "one of the prophets."² The Jews had been brought up to the memory of a prophet/miracle-worker and were expecting one to appear. Consequently, when they noted in Jesus' work a vigorous and wonderful combination of "word" and "deed," this did not fail to have its effect.

Besides this personal "thread" we encounter a second one, viz. the way of the revelation of God, i.e. in the activities of Jesus as Healer the Old Testament prophecy was fulfilled, realized. Jesus Himself pointed to this in the synagogue at Nazareth, Lk. 4 : 14-30, where He related the fulfilment of Isaiah 61 : 1, 2 to Himself, whilst in His message to John the Baptist, Mt. 11 : 5, Lk. 7 : 22, He referred to the fulfilment of Isaiah 29 : 18.³

Matthew draws attention to the prophecy from Isa. 53, which was fulfilled in the healings of Jesus, Mt. 8 : 16, 17. Through His many healings Jesus again and in surprising fashion impressed on the Jews that they could and in fact might only expect their healing, to the

¹ See the chapter: Miracles and Medicine.

² Mt. 16 : 14 and parallel passages; Lk. 7 : 16, Jn. 6 : 14.

³ As regards Jesus' activity as reader of the "Prophetenperikope," see STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1, p. 165 ff. SNAITH, The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament, concludes that in Deutero-Isaiah there is a relationship between the concepts of righteousness and salvation. "We see therefore that in Second-Isaiah the word *tsedeq-tsedeqah* (righteousness) has come to mean 'salvation'. The Righteousness of God shows itself in His saving work . . . The idea of Salvation is everywhere dominant. The mission is re-echoed in Isaiah LXI. If. It is not without significance that when the Lord Jesus declared His mission in the synagogue of Nazareth of Galilee, Luke IV. 17-21, He based His claim on Isaiah LXI. I f." The same applies to Lk. 7 : 22 (p. 92 f.). Cf. VRIEZEN, Hoofddlijnen der Theologie v.h. O.T., p. 43 f., on the significance of Deutero-Isaiah. "As far as the story of Revelation is concerned, the climax is reached with Deutero-Isaiah in the Old Testament; what comes after him does not bring anything essentially new, it is genuine 'Nachgeschichte'" (p. 44). PICK, Die auf Jesus gedeuteten Stellen des AT, says that neither Isa. 35 : 5, 6, nor Isa. 61 : 1, nor Isa. 53 can be explained "christologisch." In Isa. 53 the people of Israel are meant. This Jewish scholar, who has investigated all the relevant Old Testament texts, comes to the following conclusion: "So ergibt sich aus unsern, auf Grund von Quellenstudien geführten Untersuchungen, dass *keine* der untersuchten alttestamentlichen Stellen christologischen Inhalts ist" (p. 84).

full extent of physical and mental recovery, from God, and He clearly showed them this in His word and work.

Needless to say, the miracles and healings of Jesus played a great part in the proclamation of the gospel to the pagans. Consequently, repeated references are made in old Christian literature to the great work that was done by Jesus as Healer.¹ And, the more vigorously the Christian faith spread, the more strongly and penetratingly attention was drawn to the absolutely unique nature of Jesus' work, whilst the fraudulent magical practices of His rivals and imitators were exposed in vigorous fashion. In numerous writings the pernicious work of Simon Magus (see Ac. 8 : 9 ff.), his successor Menander and their disciples was described in great detail.² The subject of further

¹ JUSTIN, *Apol.*, 22, on the person and the miracles of Jesus. EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, X, IV, 12. In a speech Christ is called "the Begetter of Life, the Bringer of Light, our great Physician and King and Lord, the Anointed of God." IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, III, 5, 2. Jesus came "as physician for those who feel ill," cf. Lk. 5 : 31, 32. TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 8. Christ brought healing by the laying on of hands. "He is therefore the Christ of Isaiah, the restorer of disease" (*Ipse igitur est Christus Esaiiae, remediator valetudinum*). TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Judaeos*, 9. The activities of the Christ must be recognized by the rule of Scripture. "For if I am not deceived, then we read in it of two distinct activities: preaching and the power of miracles" (*Oportet itaque actum Christi eius, qui venit, ad scripturarum regulam recognosci. Duplici enim, nisi fallor, operatione distinctum eum legimus, praedicationis et virtutis*). According to Tertullian the preaching is referred to in Isa. 58 : 1 ff. and the miraculous power in Isa. 35 : 4 ff. . . . As regards Jesus' activities as exorcist, see the chapter: The Healing of the Possessed.

² See among others JUSTIN, *Apol.*, 26 and 56; EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, II, XIII and XIV; ORIGEN, c. *Celsus*, VI, 11 (on Simon Magus and Dositheus. Simon Magus claimed that he was the "power of God", whilst Dositheus called himself a "son of God"). HIPPOLYTUS, *Refutatio omnium haeresium*, VI, 7, 1. TERTULLIAN, *De Anima*, XXXIV; *De Praescriptione Haereticorum*, XXXIII; IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, I, 23, 1-4 (Simon Magus believed that "the apostles themselves also performed healings by the art of magic and not through the power of God"). II, 31, 2 (Simon and Carpocrates performed their tours de force for the undoing of mankind. "For they are unable to give sight to the blind, or hearing to the deaf, or to put all the demons to rout, except those sent into men by themselves—if they do even that!; they are unable, too, to heal the weak or the crippled or the paralysed, or those tormented in some other part of the body, as often proves to be the case as a consequence of physical infirmity; nor can they restore good health from the infirmities which overtake a person from outside." Nor can they revive the dead). The figure of Simon Magus is also discussed in the apocryphal writings, see the *Pseudo-Clementine Acta Petri* (HENNECKE, *op. cit.*, pp. 212-226. Here the struggle between Peter and Simon is described) . . . For Menander, see JUSTIN, *Apol.*, 26 and 57; EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, III, XXVI. Menander, like Simon a Samaritan, called himself "the redeemer," cf. IV, VII. IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, I, 23, 5. Menander claimed to have been sent "as a Saviour for the salvation of mankind" (*se autem eum esse, qui missus sit ab invisibilibus Salvatore pro salute hominum*) . . . In later writings reference is

attacks was a certain Mark, a man "very proficient in magic arts,"¹ whilst the methods which were sometimes used for the "healings" may become evident to the reader from the practices of the miracle-worker Elchasai and his adherents.²

However, it was not only human magicians against whose activities the miracles of Jesus had to be defended. Christian polemics had also to be directed against the pagan gods, particularly those of the Greeks, whose worthlessness the Christian writers tried to prove in all kinds of ways. They did so both in serious argumentation and in mocking reproach. The main target of these attacks was Aesculapius, of whose startling healings the Christians were often made aware by the enemy camp. He was the formidable "rival" of Jesus: why could not Aesculapius be the true Saviour of mankind?³ Although

repeatedly made to the pernicious influence exerted by Simon Magus. See CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, *KATHXΗΣΙΣ ΦΩΤΙΖΟΜΕΝΩΝ*, VI, cap. 14: "Now Simon the magician is the inventor of all heresy." (*καὶ πάσης μὲν αἰρέσεως εὐρετῆς Σίμων ὁ μάγος*) EPIPHANIUS, *Adv. haereses*, Lib. I, Tom. II, *Adversus Simonianos*, I: "The first heresy is that of Simon the magician, who began at the time of Christ and still continues." In his work *ΠΕΡΙ ΑΙΠΕΣΕΩΝ*, JOHN OF DAMASCUS mentions as the 21st heresy that of the Simonians. Simon Magus "represented himself to the Samaritans as the Father and to the Jews as the Christ." For the "doctrine" of Simon Magus see among others LEISEGANG, *Die Gnosis*, Ch. III; FASCHER, *op. cit.*, p. 190 ff.

¹ EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, IV, XI, 4. See also HIPPOLYTUS, *Ref. omnium haeresium*, VI, 39.

² HIPPOLYTUS, *op. cit.*, IX, 14, 3. They (viz. Elchasai and his adherents) give instruction in magic chants and conjurations: "of application to those bitten by dogs or possessed by demons or troubled with other diseases, and we shall not remain silent about that either." The spell against hydrophobia (see IX, 15, 4) also helps against the spitting of blood, (*ἐπὶ φθισίῳ*) in the course of which "they must be immersed in water forty times for seven days." The same spell helps against possession (IX, 16, 1).

³ ARISTIDES, *Apol.*, 10: "And further they represent Aesculapius as a god, a physician, one who compounds medicines and mixes poultices as a livelihood; for he was needy; but later he was struck by lightning by Zeus on account of Tyndareus, the Lacedaemonian, and died. Now if Aesculapius, who after all was a God, could not aid himself when the lightning struck him, how could he have aided others?" JUSTIN, *Apol.*, 21. The physician Aesculapius ascended to heaven after being struck by lightning. JUSTIN, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 69. "When further tradition introduces Aesculapius as having raised the dead and healed the other diseases, should I not declare for that reason that he likewise imitated the prophecies concerning the Christ?" ORIGEN, *c. Celsum*, III, 22-25, a detailed comparison between Jesus and "a certain demoniac physician, the so-called Aesculapius." The heart of the dispute is: must Jesus be regarded as the true Saviour, or Aesculapius? CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Protr.*, II, 30, 1: "You have also a physician, not only a copper-smith (= Hephaistos), among the gods; but the physician was covetous, Aesculapius is his name." ARNOBIUS, *Adv. Gentes*, I, 41, draws the attention of his opponents, who are scorning the crucified Christ,

the prescriptions and medicines of Aesculapius were almost unsurpassable as regards their peculiar and whimsical nature and composition, the influence of this deity was tremendous.¹

How difficult it must have been for the first witnesses of the gospel, in a world in which belief in all kinds of gods bringing salvation was very much alive and superstition flourished, to pro-

to the fortunes of Aesculapius. "Have you not, after his punishment and his death by lightning, named Aesculapius, the discoverer of medicines, as the guardian and protector of health, of strength, and of safety?" (transl. Archibald Hamilton Bryce). Cf. VII, 44-48, in which Arnobius demonstrates Aesculapius' impotence.

¹ See STEPLINGER, *Antiker Aberglaube in modernen Ausstrahlungen*, p. 37. DE LEEUW, *Aelius Aristides*, remarks that the priests and sextons doubtless ensured that "he also made grateful use of recognized medicines" (p. 78) . . . HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*; VON HARNACK, *Die Mission u. Ausbreitung des Christentums*, p. 119 f. VON HARNACK points to the glory of Aesculapius, the "deus clinicus", in the days of the Empire, VON HARNACK, *Medizinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte*, pp. 68, 131 . . . The resemblance between Jesus and Aesculapius is in many respects striking and it was, according to EDELSTEIN, "the similarity between the deeds of Christ and of Asclepius that was bound to heighten the controversy between the Christian faith and the Asclepius religion" (Asclepius, II, p. 133). The old Christians recognized the power and the reality of Aesculapius just as much as those of other pagan gods, but he was in the service of evil (see II, pp. 132-138, Asclepius and Christ). Hence the alarm at the enormous influence of this deity. A number of examples may illustrate the similarity between Jesus and Aesculapius. They were both saviours and healers by means of miracles. Aesculapius had no more to do with politics than Jesus (II, p. 103). Both were moved by the fate of the poor, from whom they accepted no payment for the benefits conferred upon them (I, p. 164; II, p. 116; 176). Aesculapius wanted the healed person to lead a better life. An inscription on the Asclepieion at Lambaesis, Africa, read: "Bonus intra, melior exi," enter as a good man, leave as a better one (I, p. 164; II, p. 126 f.). The only condition Aesculapius made for healing was virtue (I, p. 198; II, p. 113: "He refused assistance only on moral grounds; those who were themselves not virtuous he would not heal. But this was the only request which he made of his patients"). Like Jesus, Aesculapius possessed knowledge of the concealed and the future (I, p. 142 f.; I, p. 148 ff.). Gradually Aesculapius acquired the privilege of a "doctor's practice" covering the entire ancient world. "The many other healing deities bowed before his might; he became the unchallenged master of the province of medicine" (II, p. 102). In his technique Aesculapius differed from Jesus in that he sometimes also used instruments (I, p. 239 f.; I, p. 232; II, p. 152). He healed by touching with the hand and lips, but also used medicine, whilst in his treatment he further employed snakes and sacred dogs. He also possessed an arsenal of most singular prescriptions (II, p. 153 f.). EDELSTEIN rightly describes as a fundamental difference between Jesus and Aesculapius the fact that Jesus' coming and ministry apply not only to the sick, but also to sinners and publicans, i.e. everybody. This idea was foreign to Aesculapius as a Greek deity (II, p. 134 ff.). RENGSTORF, *Die Anfänge der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Christusglaube und Asklepiosfrömmigkeit*, is of the opinion that the Christian point of view regarding the Aesculapius cult is already considered in the writings of John. The first of

claim the message that in Jesus Christ the true and only Redeemer and Healer of mankind had appeared!¹

In our efforts to give the widest possible background of the entire field, we have considered it necessary to view the figure of Jesus as "Healer" both in the light of the Old Testament data and against the canvas of the ancient world in its opposition to the Christian faith, as we have in particular come to know it from old Christian writings.

However, the historical survey given here is not enough. Healing, as part of the performance of miracles in general, requires a closer study, since to explain it one can put forward just as many psychological factors, with a view to both the healer and the sick, as one wants. We have raised this point a number of times already, and we shall have to come back to it again in the course of our investigation, since the point of view adopted in this matter is of fundamental importance to the view which one takes of Jesus as healer.

Rengstorff's six conclusions is as follows: "Mit grosser Wahrscheinlichkeit bereits führen sämtliche johanneische Schriften in die Anfänge der Auseinandersetzung des Christusblaubens mit der Asklepiosfrömmigkeit" (p. 30). This would in that case be the first known attempt of a Christian: "den Christusblauben gegen die Welt des antiken Mythos durchzusetzen und ihn damit vor dem Versinken in den religiösen Synkretismus der ausgehenden Antike zu bewahren"! (p. 33 f.). Rengstorff bases his theory on certain expressions and figures of speech which recall the Aesculapius cult, e.g. Jn. 4 : 42; 1 Jn. 4 : 14, Jesus is σωτήρ τοῦ κόσμου, the Saviour of the world (p. 13 ff.); ὑγιής γενέσθαι, to become healthy, which repeatedly occurs in Aesculapian inscriptions (p. 16); Jn. 9 : 1 ff.; 11 : 1 ff.; the significance of spring and water to Jn. and to Aesculapius (Pergamum) (p. 19 ff.); the significance of the serpent to Aesculapius and in Rev. 12. The fact that Aesculapius is not mentioned by name must be explained by the Jewish tradition that avoids mentioning the names of gods (p. 28). The validity of Rengstorff's theory would have to be checked by a more thorough investigation. For the temples of Aesculapius and the difference of opinion among scholars as to whether these are "Heilanstalten" or "religiöse Kult-Stätten," see HERRLICH, *Antike Wunderkuren*. HERRLICH points to the tenacity of the belief in Aesculapius, which persisted into the Middle Ages (p. 33 ff.). HEIBERG, *Naturwissenschaften u. Mathematik im klassischen Altertum*, points out that there was also a certain scepticism regarding the miracles performed by the priests of Aesculapius, as witness Aristophanes' play "The Plutus", in which the servants of Aesculapius are treated with scant respect (p. 30).

¹ Cf. ОЕРКЕ, TWNT, III, p. 198: "Der Heilgedanke greift aber in der griechischen Religion noch viel weiter und tiefer. Die Götter sind Ärzte und Heilande sowohl im kosmisch-universalen als auch in einem innerlichen Sinn... Die Götter werden zu Heilung spendenden Mittlern zwischen Zeus und den Menschen. Allen voran Asklepios!" See also BLEEKER, *De Phaenomenologie van de Heilandsfiguur*. Bleeker points to the typical traits in the Christian saviour compared with saviour figures of another type, p. 28.

For again and again we can see that attempts are made to force the healing of Jesus on to the anthropological, the psychological plane.

FENNER is of the opinion that Jesus had a "vital force" at His disposal. By this he means a pneumatic force, which was coupled with an intuitive, practical knowledge of human nature. Not only does this remind us of notions about mana, and thus draws us inside the broad frame of the history of religions, but the concepts of intuition and human knowledge also push us straight into psychology.¹

Elsewhere FENNER calls faith one of the most important remedial factors in healing. Only through faith is the way to healing made psychologically possible, whilst moreover the compelling power of the personality of the healer forms a decisive factor. Now if this "compelling power of the healer" is regarded as the one bridgehead and the "psychotherapeutical view" as the other, the link between these two is easily established, as comes to light immediately in FENNER.²

Despite GRUNDMANN's opinion that Fenner judges "very correctly" here, we believe that such a view of things is very dangerous, since it places us squarely in the middle of anthropology.³

OEPKE, too, in a "theological assessment" of the healing miracles of Jesus, allows himself to be led by the idea of Jesus' strong personality. "We are confronted with the fact of the powerful influence of Jesus' personality on the people in his environment." OEPKE will not consider suggestion, which he rightly calls "the most trivial of all conceivable analogies," but, he says: "over and above that, one may recall the salutary and by no means solely suggestive influence emanating from great doctors and also from particularly gifted persons." OEPKE therefore thinks that it may be said that

¹ FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 84. Jesus also lets His disciples share in this force. "Diese ihre Tätigkeit erscheint dadurch möglich, dass Jesus etwas von seiner eigenen pneumatischen Kraft auf sie übertragen hat, wie auch Asklepios seine wunderbare Heilkraft seinen Jüngern mitteilt." How must one picture to oneself the transfer of the "etwas" (!) of the pneumatic force?

² FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 96: "Die ntl. Krankenheilungen sind medizinisch als psychotherapeutische anzusprechen, auch wenn sie als durch mehr physische als psychische Vorgänge vermittelt gedacht worden sind." Cf. SCHNEIDER, *Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums*, I, p. 56: "Nun kann gar kein Zweifel darüber bestehen, dass Jesus Kranke geheilt hat, allerdings kaum durch medizinisches Wissen und ärztliche Technik, sondern vor allem durch die Kraft seiner Persönlichkeit."

³ GRUNDMANN, *TWNT*, II, p. 303, note 67.

Jesus was equipped "in unique perfection" with such a talent.¹ This view is, however, subject to the same objections as those which were applied to Fenner and Grundmann: analogy threatens to lead to a levelling-out process, which is not immediately nullified by the addition of "unique!"

It is easily forgotten that something very different is concerned, viz. the break-through, the functioning of the Kingdom of God! In this respect we may recall a significant pronouncement by THURNEISEN. When, according to THURNEISEN, a doctor speaks of neurosis and a pastor speaks of sin, they do not mean the same thing. For sin is something totally different from neurosis.² In the same sense it may now be said that, although psychotherapeutical treatment may have points in common with a healing performed by Jesus, nevertheless something entirely different happens. Psychotherapeutical treatment is one of the fields of human knowledge, it is of *this* world, immanent, whereas the healing miracle is a method of the revelation of God; it belongs to the transcendent and can in no way whatsoever be explained or reasoned out causally.

The theologians and apologists at the beginning of the Christian Era found themselves confronted with the task of defending the absolutely unique nature of Jesus' healings against pagan and heretical comparisons between the power of Jesus and that of all kinds of miracle-workers. In the course of the centuries the problems have assumed another aspect, and the stresses have shifted. The problem has become "scientific;" as regards the analogy, the magicians have been replaced by gifted persons with healing "impulses," psychotherapists, psychologists and psychiatrists. The disputations have deepened as a result of the new ways and unlimited possibilities offered by the rapid development of modern science. But it will never be

¹ OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 211 ff. Cf. BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 235 ff. Barth judges cautiously; however, he believes that on the strength of the ancient and the modern analogies it is possible to find the healings of Jesus: "gerade von daher mindestens in weitem Umfang gerade in ihrem ausserordentlichen Charakter aufs Neue höchst glaubhaft" (p. 236). However, he expressly says: *duo cum faciunt idem non est idem*, i.e. the miracles of Jesus are: "Wunder des Reiches Gottes," and as such they are quite different in nature from other "miracles."

² THURNEISEN, *Die Lehre von der Seelsorge*. "Das eine wie das andere gehört einer eigenen Ordnung an: der diesseitig-natürlichen die Neurose, einer jenseitigen die Sünde. Sünde ist also etwas toto genere Anderes als Neurose." As a breach between God and man sin may appear in the "cloak" of neurosis; but it is something quite different from neurosis (p. 207).

possible for the miracles of Jesus to be finally "explained" in some physical, medical or psychological laboratory.

In conclusion we may say that the only human figure eligible for comparison with the work of Jesus as Healer is the figure of the Old Testament prophet. But even this comparison holds good only in part, since Jesus was "more than a prophet."¹ The true and only "source" that we can point to for the activities of Jesus as Healer is the Message from the Old Testament that God is the true Healer. As the Son Jesus fulfils the prophetic vow. He has received the power to heal and to forgive, for these two are inseparably bound up with one another.² GRUNDMANN puts it extremely well when he says: "He is the doctor who came to the sick to heal them, i.e. he is the one who gives a new meaning to the lives of sinners, sufferers and those who have lost faith in life and in themselves by making them part of his fellowship and, in his fellowship, granting them fellowship with God. In his fellowship men begin to realize that the reason for their distress and sin is their separation from God, that this is where their disease lies and that Jesus Christ is therefore the Saviour."³

¹ Cf. the chapter: Function and Significance of Miracles in Jesus' Activities.

² HEMPEL, op. cit., formulates it concisely in the following way: "Die Aktualisierung des Heilungsmonopol Gottes in dem Heilungsmonopol Jesu ist eben eine eigenständige und unwiederholbare Erscheinung der Religionsgeschichte!" (p. 291). Cf. the chapter: Relations involved in the Miracles of Jesus. WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, Religion and Medicine: "His power to heal is therefore only the visible manifestation of another power, His power to annul the guilt and activity of sin" (p. 355). BARTH, K.D., III, 3, p. 354: "Er vergibt nicht nur die Sünden der Menschen, er beseitigt auch die Ursache ihrer Leiden. Er steht gegen die Totalität seiner Anfechtung. Er stellt ihrer Macht seine eigene, die überlegene Macht Gottes gegenüber. Er erweist sich als Sieger auf der ganzen Linie. Er handelt als vollkommener Tröster. Der Nachdruck, mit dem das neutestamentliche Zeugnis gerade darauf hingewiesen hat, ist unverkennbar." Barth says that the accounts of Jesus' feats teach us all this.

³ GRUNDMANN, TWNT, III, p. 402. See OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 595 ff., who concludes his "Theologische Zusammenfassung" on the concept Revelation in the New Testament as follows: "Offenbarung im nt.lichen Sinn ist, ganz kurz gesagt, die Selbstdarbietung des Vaters Jesu Christi zur Gemeinschaft." VON HARNACK, Medizinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte, p. 125 (89): "Das Evangelium selbst ist als die Botschaft vom Heiland und von der Heilung in die Welt gekommen. Es wendet sich an die kranke Menschheit und verspricht ihr Gesundheit. Als Arzt ist Jesus in die Mitte seines Volkes getreten . . . Leibes- und Seelenkrankheiten unterscheidet er nicht streng—er nimmt sie als die verschiedenen Äusserungen des einen grossen Leidens der Menschheit." Cf. VON HARNACK, Die Mission u. Ausbreitung des Christentums, I Band, p. 115. THURNEISEN, op. cit., p. 204, says of Jesus as healer: "Durch sein Erscheinen wird überhaupt erst aufgedeckt und manifest gemacht, wie krank die Menschen alle sind, und dass ihr Kranksein nicht nur eine Angelegenheit der Natur ist, sondern

As healer Jesus did not only give men physical recovery, but at the same time brought the joy of a new life to the healed: "thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace," Lk. 8 : 48.

viel tiefere Hintergründe hat, dass sie ihre Ursache hat im Abfall von Gott." HEMPEL, *op. cit.*, concludes his study with the comment that the ultimate aim of all God's ways is "life." In this sense the Christian doctrine is the "sound doctrine" (see 1 Ti. 1 : 10; 6 : 3; 2 Ti. 1 : 13; 4 : 3; Titus 1 : 13; 2 : 1, 2, 7 ff.). "In diesen späten Formulierungen der Pastoralbriefe und ihrem Wunsch nach Glaubensgesundheit der Gemeindeglieder . . . klingt aus, was über Heilung als Symbol und Wirklichkeit im biblischen Schrifttum zu sagen ist" (p. 312). GÖDAN, Christus u. Hippokrates. Christ's cure of souls is directed towards the "fundamental" in man, towards man's true face. "Es war die grosse Kunst Christi, dieses Gesicht gesehen zu haben bei Gesunden und Kranken, bei Lebenden und sogar bei Toten" (p. 56).

V. JESUS' METHODS OF TREATMENT

We have deliberately avoided the term "medicines," since in the healings of Jesus we can hardly speak of the prescribing or administering of medicines in the modern sense of the word. However, this does not mean to say that we do not find Jesus using various methods and performing various acts. The following may be distinguished:

- (a) Jesus did not employ any medicines.
- (b) The use of material means.
- (c) Touching and the laying on of hands.
- (d) The Word.
- (e) Details: the look; looking up and sighing; taking aside.
- (f) Healing at a distance.
- (g) The duration of healing.

(a) *Medicines.*

Nowhere in the Gospels is it stated that Jesus prescribed medicines for the sick. The sick person came himself to Jesus, or was brought to Him. Sometimes Jesus took the initiative, and the sick person left healed, after some word or the other had been spoken or after a simple treatment. At quite an early stage it was pointed out that Jesus performed His healings without using medicines or magical practices. EUSEBIUS quotes the letter from Abgar of Edessa, the beginning of which reads as follows: "Abgar Uchama, Ruler, greets Jesus, the good Saviour, who has appeared in the area of Jerusalem. I have heard speak of you and your cures, namely that these are done by you without medicines and herbs." ¹

ARNOBIUS opposes the assertion that Jesus was a magician. Can you name me any magician, he asks, who did anything like Jesus? "Who has done this without any power of incantations, without the juice of herbs and of grasses, without any anxious watching of sacrifices, of libations, or of seasons?" ² "And yet it is agreed that

¹ EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., I, XIII, 6.

² ARNOBIUS, Adv. Gentes, I, 43: "Qui sine ulla vi carminum, sine herbarum et graminum succis, sine ulla aliqua observatione sollicita sacrorum, libaminum, temporum?"

Christ performed all those miracles which he wrought without any aid from external things, without the observance of any ceremonial, without any definite mode of procedure, [but solely] by the inherent might of his authority.”¹

In Justin, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria and others, we also encounter pronouncements along the same lines; the things happen in answer to Jesus’ commanding word.² In the testimony on Jesus in the Slavonic Josephus the following occurs: “and all that he did by an invisible power he worked by word and command.”³ Attention is repeatedly drawn by faith healers to this direct nature of Jesus’ healings, this intervention and healing by a spiritual force, and for instance MARY BAKER EDDY refers to it again and again. “From beginning to end, the Scriptures are full of accounts of the triumph of Spirit, Mind, over matter.”⁴ MARY BAKER EDDY argues that belief in medicine has displaced belief in God.⁵ Jesus healed the sick “always in opposition, never in obedience to physics,”⁶ whilst He nevertheless was “the most scientific man that ever trod the globe.”⁷

Although Jesus did not use any medicines, we do find that He employed a number of means which have played an important part in folk medicine of all times and places.

(b) *The use of material means*

In their dynamistic world of ideas primitive peoples see the body charged with all kinds of forces. Almost everywhere in the world spittle, blood (especially menstrual blood), urine, faeces, the placenta, the nails, the hair, etc., are full of “soul force.” For that reason great care must be taken with these “forces” of the body.⁸ An important part is played

¹ ARNOBIUS, op. cit., I, 44: “Atqui constitit Christum sine ullis adminiculis rerum, sine ullius observatione, vel lege, omnia illa, quae fecit, nominis sui possibilitate fecisse.”

² Cf. W. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 365.

³ Cf. VAN DER LOOS, *Jezus Messias-Koning*, p. 213.

⁴ BAKER EDDY, *Science and Health*, p. 139.

⁵ Op. cit., p. 146: “The ancient Christians were healers. Why has this element of Christianity been lost? Because our systems of religion are governed more or less by our systems of medicine. The first idolatry was faith in matter. The schools have rendered faith in drugs the fashion, rather than faith in Deity,” cf. pp. 148, 157, 369: “Jesus never asked if disease were acute or chronic, and he never recommended attention to laws of health, never gave drugs, never prayed to know if God were willing that a man should live.”

⁶ Op. cit., p. 170.

⁷ Op. cit., p. 313.

⁸ VAN DER LEEUW in “De godsdiensten der wereld,” I, p. 58 ff. Cf. WARNECK,

among these forces by spittle; it can be employed both for good and for evil, positively or negatively. Not only the deity, but also the devil can make use of it.¹ The Assyrians had a "spittle of life" and a "spittle of death."² Babylonian inscriptions speak of both the curative properties and the baneful power of spittle.³ When in the battle between the Egyptian gods Horus and Seth Horus' eye was injured — Horus' eyes were called "the divine pair, the unscathed pair, the living pair" — Horus' face was spat upon to heal the eye.⁴ The prayer of an Ewe priest in North-West Africa was as follows: "I have no spittle in my mouth. You are the possessor of spittle. Come then and spray your spittle over this medicine."⁵

Among the North Papuans a sovereign remedy for driving out the demon disease is to spit upon the sick person and to strike him with leaves.⁶ In Indonesia we find the belief that sacrifices and objects become more powerful when they have been spat upon.⁷ On the island of Nias the priest rubbed his spittle into a wound, and in Java spittle was in very common use as a medicine.⁸ Curative properties are also attributed to the spittle of animals; people had

Die Lebenskräfte des Evangeliums, p. 25 ff. FRAZER, *The Golden Bough*, Part II, Ch. V, Tabooed things; Aftermath, a supplement to *The Golden Bough*, Ch. XXII.

¹ SCHMIDT, *Endsynthese der Religionen*, p. 39 . . . SCHMIDT also gives the following interesting picture from the nomadic primitive culture: "Der Teufel gibt (haucht) dem Menschen eine Seele ein (nur 3 Belege: Altai-Tataren, Mongolen, Mordwinen). Er bespeit den ganzen Leib des Menschen (8); deshalb wird der Körper sterblich (Burjäten), wird der Mensch krank (Mordwinen), kommen Krankheit, Sünde, Leiden (Raskolniken), beginnen die Krankheiten (Grossrussen) . . . Die Bespeigung des Menschen durch den Teufel, die in diesem Falle kein Segen, sondern ein Fluch, rechter Teufelssegens ist, bewirkt und erklärt nun, dass der Mensch den Krankheiten und dem Tode unterworfen ist," p. 48 . . . There is thus a link between devil, disease, suffering and death, in which spittle plays a major role.

² EITREM, *Demonology*, p. 46.

³ A. JEREMIAS, *Babylonisches im N.T.*, p. 108.

⁴ DE BUCK in Van der Leeuw, "De Godsdiensten der wereld," I, p. 84.

⁵ HEILER, *Das Gebet*, p. 65.

⁶ KOTY, *Die Behandlung der Alten u. Kranken b. d. Naturvölkern*, p. 30.

⁷ KRUYT, *Het Animisme*, p. 39 ff.; cf. WARNECK, *Die Lebenskräfte des Evangeliums*, p. 31 f., where all kinds of interesting examples are given . . . Cf. FRAZER, *The Golden Bough*, Part II, § 9, Spittle tabooed, pp. 287-290. "The same fear of witchcraft which has led so many people to hide or destroy their loose hair and nails has induced other or the same people to treat their spittle in a like fashion. For on the principles of sympathetic magic the spittle is part of the man, and whatever is done to it will have a corresponding effect on him" (p. 287).

⁸ KRUYT, *op. cit.*, p. 61 f.

their wounds licked by a sacred cow or by dogs, as for instance the people living around Galela on the island of Halmahera.¹ The power of the spittle can be reinforced by mixing it with the "force" of all kinds of plants or by chewing betel-nut.² This is reminiscent of the treatment applied by the sheiks of the Middle East; these often chew a talisman to pieces in their mouths and spit out the pulp over the sick person.³ The spittle of sanctified persons is regarded as highly medicinal; such persons are at liberty to spit in someone's face.⁴ What holds good today among primitive peoples held good throughout the ancient world. PLINY wrote at length about the use of spittle.⁵ TACITUS and Suetonius tell us that the spittle of Emperor Vespasian was medicinal.⁶ The chorus in ARISTOPHANES' "The Peace" sings: "Spit with all your might" on the heads of the tragedians Morsimos, Melanthios and their consorts "but dance with me, goddess and muse, dance the festive round dance."⁷ And in his *Plutus* ARISTOPHANES tells how the serpents of Aesculapius lick the eyelids of the blind god Plutus.⁸ The celebrated physician Galen particularly recommended the spittle of a fasting man.⁹ We

¹ KRUYT, *op. cit.*, p. 130 ff.

² KLUIN, *Het geestesleven der Natuurvolken*, p. 51; KRUYT, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

³ CANAAN, *Aberglaube*, p. 118... In the Palestine of Canaan's day "old women," who were usually called in to help children, liked to use spittle. Various skin diseases were treated with spittle, in particular with spittle from a person who had not broken his fast, p. 120.

⁴ KRUYT, *op. cit.*, p. 61... A headman of the Fang (West Africa) greeted a missionary with particular amicability by seizing his hand and spitting into it. For that means blowing a blessing into it; see WARNECK, *op. cit.*, p. 32.

⁵ PLINY, *Hist. nat.*, XXVIII, VII. Spittle from a man who has not broken his fast (*salivaieiuna*) helps against snake-poison and serves as an antidote against epilepsy (*Despuimus comitiales morbos, hoc est contagia regerimus*). It may be believed that skin diseases and attacks of leprosy are healed by treatment with spittle (*credamus ergo et lichenas leprasqueieiunae inlitu adsiduo arceri*), as also inflammations of the eye (*lippiitudines*), malignant tumours (*carcinomata*), etc. Cf. XXVIII, XXII, on the curative power of women's spittle (*salivaieiunae mulieris*).

⁶ TACITUS, *Hist.*, IV, 81. Suetonius, *Vespasianus*, VII.

⁷ ARISTOPHANES, *EIPHNNH*, 815 f.: ὦν καταχρεμψαμένη μέγα καὶ πλατὺ Μοῦσα Θεὰ μετ' ἐμοῦ ξύμπαιζε τὴν ἑορτήν (Aristophane, *Texte établi par V. Coulon et traduit par H. van Daele*. Paris, 1923-1930). Cf. WEINREICH, *Gebet u. Wunder*, p. 179.

⁸ ARISTOPHANES, *ΠΛΟΥΤΟΣ*, 736 ff.: τὰ βλέφαρα περιέλειχον, ὥς γέ μοῦδόκει-καὶ πρὶν σε, κοτύλας ἐκπιεῖν οἴνου δέκα-ὁ Πλούτος, ὃ δέσποιν', ἀνίστηται βλέπων. Cf. EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 46... ESSER, *Das Antlitz der Blindheit in der Antike*, points to the widespread popular belief that spittle could heal diseased eyes and could even restore sight to eyes that were blind (p. 136).

⁹ EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

have quoted sufficient examples from various peoples, religions and periods to demonstrate what an important function spittle fulfils. The people of Israel formed no exception. In the Old Testament spitting is referred to in a negative, degrading sense, the ignominious spittle.¹ The New Testament speaks of spitting as a means of defamation and as a medicine. Jesus is spat upon, Mt. 26 : 67; 27 : 30. Rev. 3 : 16 states that the lukewarm are spat out of the mouth. Three references are made to spitting in the positive, healing sense.² In Judaism spittle was regarded as highly medicinal. Eye trouble was healed by spitting on the eye in question, and spittle from a man who had not broken his fast was considered to possess particularly great curative powers. It was a very common practice to spit on the sick parts of the body when pronouncing conjurations, so as to drive out the demon who had ensconced himself in this sick part of the body.³

Jesus used spittle three times in His healings: once in the case of a deaf and dumb man, twice in the case of blind persons. Why did He do so? Must this merely be regarded as a primitive custom?⁴ Did Jesus use this external agent as a concession to those of little faith, as He did when He permitted His disciples to use oil?⁵ Delitzsch' view that Jesus regarded spittle as a medicine is rejected by JEREMIAS, who himself regards this act of Jesus as a deed of symbolic and pedagogic value.⁶ FENNER is of the opinion that spitting has more than a merely symbolic value. Jesus used spittle as a valued folk medicine, the apotropaic force of which is indicated in the Greek text of Gal. 4 : 14. Once it has left the mouth, spittle replaces the

¹ See Lev. 15 : 8; Nu. 12 : 14; Deu. 25 : 9; Job 30 : 10; Isa. 50 : 6.

² Mk. 7 : 33 (the deaf and dumb man); 8 : 23 (the blind man); Jn. 9 : 6 (the man born blind; Jesus made clay by means of spittle).

³ STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 15 ff. BLAU, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, p. 162 f. EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*, p. 281. PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 96 ff.; p. 321 f. For the use of oil and spittle as medicines on the Sabbath, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 627 f.

⁴ CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 17. GILS, *Jésus Prophète*, p. 119, remarks that Jesus did not heal the deaf and dumb man, Mk. 7, and the blind man, Mk. 8, in the ordinary way: "mais en se servant de salive, s'accommodant par là probablement à une mentalité païenne."

⁵ F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 109.

⁶ A. JEREMIAS, *op. cit.*, p. 108 . . . DROOGLEEVER FORTUYN, *Kwakzalverij, Bijgeloof en Geneeskunst*, p. 107: "Sometimes there is a logical idea behind the use of a certain medicine. For instance, spittle promotes the healing of minor injuries in the mouth." The writer refers to Mk. 8 : 23, 24.

"soul of the breath," becomes "condensed breath."¹ OEPKE does not make a very startling assertion when he says that the treatment with spittle appears more primitive than medical. He believes, however, that there may have been particular reasons for applying it to the insentient sufferers, unless the accounts are merely additions by tradition.² The various opinions reveal how difficult it is to penetrate this world of ideas. "What value our Lord attributed to the use of spittle it is impossible to say," says MICKLEM, who remarks, however, that we may not assume any animistic thoughts in Jesus.³ FENNER judges rightly that, although this treatment resembles that given by the magicians, we may not think of magic in the case of Jesus,⁴ and that spittle and oil, and also the instruction to bathe, are "indifferent means," like some which are still therapeutically prescribed nowadays.⁵ STRACK-BILLERBECK makes an important remark when he says that when we read Mk. 7 : 33 we must not think of the usual application of spittle in conjurations. But the sick person would have known that this custom existed. Now, according to STRACK-BILLERBECK, Jesus acted in accordance with this knowledge of the sick person: "whilst he touches the tongue of the deaf and dumb man with his spittle, he signifies to this man that he must expect his healing from the person who stands before him. Jesus' act relates only to the arousing of this belief, which precedes the healing proper; the healing itself is then effected by the word of Jesus."⁶ This explanation is on much the same lines as that of CALVIN, who says that Jesus made free use of external signs which were of most service to man. By moistening sufferers with spittle He wished to indicate that the power of speech was given only through Him, and by placing His finger in the ears He taught "that it was his real work as it were to pierce the ears of the deaf and dumb man."⁷ However, we believe that CALVIN and STRACK-BILLERBECK are too one-sided in their accentuation when they interpret the use of spittle solely as a kind of

¹ FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 91 f.

² OEPKE, *TWNT*, III, p. 209.

³ MICKLEM, *Miracles*, p. 104.

⁴ FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 92. Jesus does not practise "technisch ausgebildete Zauberei," as Orelli formulates magic.

⁵ FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁶ STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 17.

⁷ CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mk. 7 : 32: "Sicuti nunc linguae sputum aspergens, notare voluit loquendi facultatem a se uno transfundi: digitum in auriculas mittens, docuit proprium esse suum munus surdas aures quasi perforare."

sign language or a means of arousing belief. In our opinion we are concerned here with an important mental means of salvation. By using spittle Jesus enters the mental world of the patient and gains his confidence. For this reason His action is more than a sign and a symbol; it is the *action* that brings salvation! There were doubtless many who believed that the spittle of this "holy one of God," this "prophet," was charged with the power to heal. Regarded against the background of the universal belief in the curative power of spittle, it is not surprising that Jesus did in fact bring salvation to the sick by an action which modern man stigmatizes as a popular belief.

The second material means was not a secretion like spittle, but a much-used folk medicine, viz. oil; a means that Jesus Himself perhaps used occasionally,¹ and which was certainly employed by His disciples.² Oil was used for all kinds of purposes,³ but was particularly favoured as a medicine. The Egyptian goddess Isis prepared healing oil, "the medicine of immortality," for her son Horus.⁴ PLINY says that oil makes the body soft and relieves pain.⁵ Isa. 1 : 6 also refers to the soothing effect of oil (ointment) on wounds and sores. Herod the Great was placed in a bath of warm oil on the instructions of his physicians, a treatment which disagreed with him.⁶ Besides this application, which in a certain sense is a directly medical one, we also encounter the use of oil as a defence against disease-producing demons.⁷ In essence these two aspects are inseparable. Solomon's Testament contains the following: "If someone throws salt in oil and anoints the sick person, saying cherubim, seraphim, help! he [i.e. the demon] flees at once." Here the preventive

¹ MICKLEM, op. cit., p. 105: "Perhaps Jesus sometimes employed this remedy also."

² Mk. 6 : 13; cf. Lk. 10 : 34, the treatment of wounds by oil and wine. Jas. 5 : 14, anointing with oil in the name of the Lord. Cf. ROPES, St. James, re Jas. 5 : 14.

³ For the meat offering, Lev. 2; as medicine, Isa. 1 : 6; for anointing, Mic. 6 : 15; for illumination, Ex. 27 : 20 f., Mt. 25 : 3 ff. See GALLING, Bibl. Reallexikon, col. 402 ff.

⁴ REITZENSTEIN, Hellen. Wundererzählungen, p. 103 ff. This oil is: φάρμακον τῆς ἀθανασίας.

⁵ SEE SCHLIER, TWNT, II, p. 470 . . . Dioscorides, the most authoritative pharmacotherapeutist of Antiquity, first century A.D., recommends the use of oil (ELAUT, Antieke Geneeskunde, p. 225).

⁶ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, De bello Jud., I, XXXIII, 5.

⁷ EITREM, op. cit., p. 23 . . . SCHLIER, TWNT, I, p. 232: "Im neuen Testament ist die Ölsalbung eine medizinisch-exorzistische Handlung an Kranken."

force is doubled, for salt likewise drives out demons.¹ The Talmud makes several references to the use of oil as medicine, giving certain instructions regulating its use on the Sabbath.² When in early Christianity anointing with oil acquired a sacramental character, the view that it had curative power and apotropaic force still persisted. A prayer for aid for the congregation of the deacon Xenophon includes the words: "anoint them with holy oil, heal their wounds and save them from the raging wolves."³ Elsewhere the oil, poured into a silver goblet, with a view to baptism, is praised as a "fruit finer than other fruits," as the "most compassionate," "sign and joy of the weary."⁴

In a prayer for oil for the sick it is praised as "a means of driving out every disease and infirmity, as an antidote for every demon, as a means of expelling every unclean spirit, of banishing every evil spirit, of driving out every fever heat and cold fever and every infirmity."⁵ TERTULLIAN states how Severus, the father of Antoninus, was mindful of the Christians: "for he also sought the Christian Proculus, surnamed Torpacion, the procurator of Euhodia, who had once healed him by means of oil, and kept him in his palace until his death."⁶ CALVIN argues that the oil was not meant as a natural medicine. With reference to Mk. 6 : 13 he remarks that this anointing with oil "was a visible symbol of the spiritual grace by means of which they testified that the healing came from the secret force of God, whose servants they were. For under the law it was the custom to depict the grace of the spirit by oil."⁷ CALVIN is again too one-sided in his accentuation; he does not appreciate the medicinal value

¹ CANAAN, Dämonenglaube, p. 42. Cf. HAUCK, TWNT, I, p. 229.

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 428 f.; II, p. 11 f.

³ Acta Thom., cap. 67. (HENNECKE, Neutestam. Apokr., p. 273).

⁴ Acta Thom., cap. 157.

⁵ In the Euchologion of the Serapion of Thmuis, see SCHLIER, TWNT, I, p. 231 f. . . . Cyril of Jerusalem, in his twentieth speech to those receiving baptism, praises consecrated oil, which puts demons to flight.

⁶ TERTULLIAN, Ad Scapulam, IV: "Ipse etiam Severus, pater Antonini, Christianorum memor fuit. Nam et Proculum Christianum, qui Torpacion cognominabatur, Euhodiae procuratorem, qui eum per oleum aliquando curaverat, requisivit et in palatio suo habuit usque ad mortem eius."

⁷ CALVIN, Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas, re Mk. 6 : 13: "Sed nihil minus consentaneum est quam Apostolos ordinariis et naturalibus remediis usos esse, quae Christi miraculis nebulas offunderent . . . Constituo igitur fuisse hoc visibile symbolum spiritualis gratiae, quo testati sunt provenire ex arcana Dei virtute sanitatem, cuius ministri erant. Nam oleo Spiritus gratiam figurari, sub Lege usitatum fuit."

of the oils used, for we can hardly accept that the empirical knowledge of the ancients in this matter was of absolutely no value.

(c) *Touching and the laying on of hands*

Touching and the laying on of hands play an important part in the New Testament. The Gospels many times state that Jesus touched someone; the action proceeds from Him. Jesus touched a leper, Mt. 8 : 3 and parallel passages; the hand of Peter's mother-in-law, Mt. 8 : 15; the eyes of blind men, Mt. 9 : 29; His fearful disciples, Mt. 17 : 7, the eyes of blind men, Mt. 20 : 34; the tongue of the deaf and dumb man, Mk. 7 : 33; the bier of the young man at Nain, Lk. 7 : 14; the servant's ear, Lk. 22 : 51.

We also find it stated that Jesus is touched. The sick beg for His touch or touch Him themselves, Mk. 3 : 10; 6 : 56; 8 : 22; Lk. 6 : 19. The clothing of Jesus is also touched, Mt. 9 : 20; Mt. 14 : 36.

Touching plays an influential part in the religious life of peoples. The more power, mana, someone possesses, the more power he can transfer. Hence the great role played by the hand, in particular the right hand and certain fingers. Healing and ruin, salvation and disaster may be a person's lot if he is touched favourably or unfavourably. The hand of the gods (Marduk, Zeus) may bring blessing or destruction, as may the hand of persons with a power in them, such as the *hadjis* among the Mohammedans.¹

In the Old Testament we repeatedly encounter the idea that the power of God is personified in His hand.² According to WEINREICH, primitive thought, in the infancy of both peoples and the individual, sees independent forces at work in the various parts of the body, especially in the hand. These forces are independent of the body as a whole. He recalls that children for a long time regard their hands as special beings. WEINREICH regards this independence of the hand as being very graphically illustrated by the hand of Yahweh. It was said of Aesculapius and Hygieia that they held out their hands to the

¹ EITREM, op. cit., p. 33: "The hand is the symbol of will and activity, power and authority. Moreover, it is since the oldest times everywhere (e.g. in Egypt) a mighty apotropaicum (finger or fingers—espec. forefinger, middle finger or 'heartfinger' or outstretched arm). The arm of God and magicians is ambivalent, it implies good or evil, help or punishment."

² Nu. 11 : 23; 33 : 3; Deu. 33 : 3; 1 Sa. 5 : 7; 6 : 5; 1 Ch. 29 : 12. Job. 5 : 18. Job. 19 : 21 (the hand of God hath touched me. **נָגַע** = touch, strike, hit). Especially in the psalms and the prophets, see Psalms 10 : 12; 21 : 8; 31 : 5; 38 : 2; 44 : 2; 95 : 4; 139 : 5; Isa. 1 : 25; 5 : 12; 11 : 11; 26 : 11; 48 : 13; Jer. 16 : 21; Dan. 5 : 23; Zach. 13 : 7 and elsewhere. Cf. ELDERENBOSCH, *De oplegging der handen*, p. 13 ff.

sick, and a healing force flowed from these hands, whilst Aesculapius touched the diseased eyes, mouth, ears, etc., of those who sought healing in incubation in the temple at Epidaurus. There was a widespread idea that the gods extended their hands in blessing and protection over towns and men.¹ WEINREICH shrewdly asks whether, when we consider this touching, we should think solely of the miraculous power of the hand or also of medical aid. He recalls the pronouncement of the physician Soranus, who said that birth pangs are relieved by touching with warm hands, and also points to the view of Blinkenberg that the oldest form of medicine was exclusively chirurgery, working with the hands.² As special parts of the body destined for special functions the hands had to be kept clean, which is why they had to be washed frequently. Remember the ritual washings of the Jews, see Mt. 15 : 2. According to the Talmud, these washings were also concerned with defence against demons who settled on the hands at night.³ Compare this with what JANET says about the mentally ill whose obsession centres around their faces or their hands, for instance. He mentions the case of someone who washed her hands two hundred times a day.⁴ To this group of ideas also belongs the belief that the hand can do valuable service as an amulet. Above the doors of many Jewish houses in Palestine a coloured or a stone hand could be found, symbolizing the hand of God, which had to keep away evil spirits and protect the house.⁵ This whole set of ideas of blessing, protection, qualification, con-

¹ See the instructive chapter on the Hand of God (ΘΕΟΥ ΧΕΙΡ) in WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, pp. 1-75. Touching with the foot can also bring healing (Vespasian). Pyrrhus had power in his big toe, which remained unscathed when he was burnt and was worshipped as a relic. The (holy) kiss also has curative powers.

² WEINREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 30, who quotes Blinkenberg, *Arch. Studien*, 1904, p. 102. BLINKENBERG's view that the healing force of the divine hand originates from chirurgery does not satisfy Weinreich.

³ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 695 ff. Rabbi Nathan (ca. 160) warned against the female demon Bath-Horion, the "free one", who attaches herself to hands which are not washed in the mornings. She closely watches whether one washes one's hands three times. Cf. EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*, p. 182; HAUCK, *TWNT*, IV, p. 945 f. ELZINGA, *Geloof en geneeskunde*, points out that religion, hygiene and morality are not separate concepts among the Israelites, but rather "reciprocal concepts." They merge into one another and overlap (p. 37). Cf. Chapter II: *Hygiënische maatregelen in de Pentateuch*, pp. 13-37.

⁴ JANET, *Les Obsessions et la Psychasthénie*, p. 45.

⁵ L. BAUER, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*, p. 199. CANAAN, *Aberglaube*, p. 64.

separation, transfer, healing and apotropaism is also expressed in the "laying on of hands," which played an important part in the old Church and was given a sacramental character. The power of the deity and of the miracle-worker, the physician, is therefore concentrated in the hand.¹

It is in the light of this world of ideas that touching and being touched by Jesus must be seen. EITREM makes an apposite remark when he says that Jesus did not introduce a new kind of gesture when He stretched out His hand to the sick and to children to bless them and to heal them.² In His methods of treatment, too, Jesus stands right in the midst of the world of ideas of His contemporaries, but without resorting to grotesque methods, as the magicians did. He never protected His hands with amulets, a frequent practice of magicians.³ Owing to the fact that Jesus — and also His disciples — touched those seeking help, virtue emanated from Him, which was confirmed out of Jesus' own mouth, Mk. 5 : 30, Lk. 6 : 19. Touching and the word are thus most closely interconnected. PERELS believes that the oldest tradition preserved only healings by the word. He says: "It is possible and even probable that Jesus moreover also touched the sick now and again, and that the account of the touching, together with the word of power, has become the source of the tradition of healing by touch."⁴ He sees Hellenistic influences in the tradition of healing by touch and therefore regards Mt. 9 : 21 as an insertion. It is not clear to us why such a separation is necessary.

¹ Cf. GRONDIJS, *De Iconographie van schepping en Godsverschijningen*, p. 81 ff., on the hand of God in pagan worship on the shores of the Mediterranean and in Christian art . . . For the laying on of hands as ordination of rabbis, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 647 ff.

² EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 34. As a result of touching, ἅπτω, ψάω, with the hand contact, ἐπαφή, ψαῦσις, comes about . . . The laying on of hands, ἐπίθεσις τῶν χειρῶν, is reminiscent of the laying of hands on the sacrificial animal, see Lev. 1 : 4; 4 : 4. Cf. DE BOER, *De Voorbede in het O.T.*, p. 165. "The verb **תַּס** can best be translated by: to realize (divine) force. In Gen. XXVII 37 it means: give the force of blessing." SCHUBERT, *Die Gemeinde vom toten Meer*, p. 121 f., says that healing by the laying on of hands is one of the: "spezifischen Gemeinsamkeiten zwischen der Praxis Jesu und den Qumrantexten."

³ EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 36 f. . . Nor did Jesus use a magic wand. In the representations in the catacombs Jesus is depicted using a magic wand (like Moses when he struck the rock) in the miracles of the loaves and the resurrection of the dead. See BAUERNFEIND, *TWNT*, VI, p. 970. In HERMAS, vis. III, 2, 4, reference is made to a "shining staff" (βάβδον τινὰ λαμπράν), whilst in Sim. IX, 6, 3, a tall "man" inspects the stones of a building with a staff. The rejected stones changed colour or shape.

⁴ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 91, cf. p. 96.

For why should Hellenism be called in when the link with the Old Testament is evident? When considering touching by Jesus, we must think first of all of the Old Testament conception of the hand of God which brings salvation, and then of the transfer of the power of the prophets by physical contact, 1 Ki. 17 : 21, or by touching with objects belonging to prophets, 2 Ki. 4 : 29. The fact that the people regarded Jesus as a prophet points clearly in this direction. The men of Emmaus spoke of Jesus as a man "which was a prophet mighty in deed and word (note the order!) before God and all the people," Lk. 24 : 19. Now how can this "force" be put into words? GRUNDMANN has made an attempt, and wishes to introduce the term "essence of power," the traces of which he sees in Mt. 14 : 36 and parallel passage. He believes that Luke in particular portrayed Christ as a "vessel of power endowed with an essence of power."¹ We are a little chary of such expressions, since they are too reminiscent of "mana" and those charged with it. We therefore also query Fenner's statement that we are concerned with an "ethereal fluid."² This looks rather occult. But equally incorrect is to us the view that touching is nothing more than a symbolic, pedagogic or utilitarian action, as CALVIN sees it. He says that Jesus touched the sick, either out of love "or because he knew that this symbol might be useful at that moment."³ CALVIN says that he prefers the simple explanation: "that Christ laid his hands on the sick so that, commending them to the Father, he could obtain for them grace and relief from their

¹ GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 63 f. In connection with this, reference may be made to what THOMAS, III, qu. XLIV, art. III, says. Christ came to save the world: "not only by his divine power, but [also] by the mystery of his incarnation" (*non solum virtute divina, sed per mysterium Incarnationis ipsius*). For that reason He used not only his divine power, but also the fact that He was a man. "Although as God he could have expelled all diseases by his word, he nevertheless touches all, thus demonstrating that his own flesh possessed the power of furnishing medicines" (*Quamvis ut Deus potuisset omnes verbo pellere morbos: tangit tamen omnes, ostendens propriam carnem efficacem ad praestanda remedia*) . . . What Grundmann calls "essence of power" is to Thomas the mystery of Christ's incarnation.

² FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 83. This fluid also imparts itself to Jesus' clothes, cf. Mk. 5 : 27 ff.; 6 : 56, etc. "Die Vorstellung stofflicher Substanz feinsten Art liegt allen Ausdrücken des Neuen Testaments für diese göttliche Lebens- und Heilkraft zugrunde."

³ CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mk. 1 : 29: "Quamquam autem solo nutu id poterat, manum tamen eius tetigit, vel exprimendi affectus causa, vel quia symbolum hoc tunc utile esse noverat. Scimus enim pro temporis ratione externis symbolis libere fuisse usum."

ills.”¹ Before we go further into this problem, we ought to ask ourselves what prompted those who touched Jesus or His clothing. It is impossible to assume only pure motives of faith here. People heard about Jesus' startling healings, joined the throng of those seeking salvation, and tried to touch Him, and there is nothing to prevent us from thinking here of mass emotion and a concomitant increased sensibility. But we get off the track if, like MACKINNON, we speak of autosuggestion which, in such cases as are mentioned in for instance Mk. 3 : 10 and 6 : 56, brings the much coveted physical effect.² It is the track that SCHÄFER follows with his assertion that “healings by merely touching Jesus' clothing must be explained in natural fashion by suggestion, autosuggestion,” which he illustrates by examples drawn from the world of toothache!³ The sooner the unfortunate expression “suggestion” disappears from the explanation of Jesus' miracles, the better. Throughout the Gospels it is stated that the power of love of Jesus Christ brought healing and not that it was the result of an evoked or self-induced “picture” that one would be healed!

We stated above that we can hardly assume only pure motives of faith, which is very evident from the touching of Jesus' clothing.⁴ The motivation for this touching is to be found in the widespread belief that the dignity and the power of a person pass into his clothing.⁵ Likewise, cultic and physical impurity transplants itself to the garments, see Lev. 15 : 27, 17 : 15. With regard to the ring and the clothing that Pharaoh gave to Joseph, Gen. 41 : 42, PEDERSEN says: “Thus the clothes follow and partake of the total character of the soul. . . Honour must appear in the garments worn, because the soul of the man penetrates everything that belongs to his entirety.”⁶ And it was with this in mind that the Pharisees endeavoured to pre-

¹ CALVIN, op. cit., re Lk. 4 : 39. Under the Law the laying on of hands was a sign of reconciliation. “Fuit autem reconciliationis signum sub Lege . . . Sed ego Christum simpliciter interpretor manus imposuisse aegrotis, ut eos Patri commendans, gratiam et liberationem a morbis impetraret.”

² MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 344.

³ SCHÄFER, *Jesus in psychiatrischer Beleuchtung*, p. 66. “Jesus war ein faszinierender Suggestiv-Therapeut, durchaus optima fide. Nur in einem Punkte unterscheidet er sich von solchen aller Zeiten: er nahm kein Geld” (p. 68).

⁴ Mt. 14 : 36; Mk. 5 : 27; Mk. 6 : 56; Lk. 8 : 46.

⁵ FENNER, op. cit., p. 83. BERTHOLET in RGG, III, col. 1066 ff.

⁶ PEDERSEN, *Israel, its Life and Culture*, I - II, p. 227. BLAU, *Das altjüdische Zauberberwesen*, p. 82: “Die Kleider des Menschen vertreten nach talmudischer Auffassung den Menschen selbst.”

serve their strict and cultic purity. "The clothes of the Am-haarez, the common people, are unclean for the Pharisees."¹

When the veneration of relics began in the old Church, belief in "healing by touch" grew alarmingly: graves, bones, images, altarcloths, coins, rings, etc., etc., all of these brought healing (!).² This long list also includes the notion of the healing handkerchiefs or aprons of Paul, Ac. 19 : 12, and that of the healing shadow of Peter, Ac. 5 : 15. For the shadow was part of the personality. A typical example of the power of the shadow is preserved in an Egyptian tale. Someone once walked in the shadow of a Pharaoh's parasol. A relative of the Pharaoh interposed his person, saying: "The shadow of the Pharaoh, your master, falls on you," whereupon the Pharaoh cried out in irritation: "Leave him be!" To walk in the shadow of the Pharaoh thus meant to be under his authority and his protection.³ A good pendant to this story is that of a walking-stick. A missionary had healed a child. The father of the child then took the missionary's walking-stick and pressed its knob against a wart on his son, in the hope that this would cure him of it.⁴ The peoples of Indonesia regard the shadow as the "personification" of the soul force.⁵ Footsteps also became objects of veneration at a later date.⁶

Belief in healing by the touch of special persons assumed a typical form in Europe in the belief that kings could heal. In his profusely

¹ SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, II, p. 385. Hagiga, II, 7, states how clothes become unclean in stages. Those of the common people, the Am-haarez, are unclean for the Pharisees; those of the Pharisees for the priests; those of the priests for the officiating priests.

² See STEPLINGER, *Antiker Aberglaube*. VAN ANDEL, *Klassieke wondermiddelen*, p. 35: In Spain the spectators at a bullfight dip their handkerchiefs in the blood of a dead bull to use it as medicine.

³ MASPERO, *Les contes populaires de l'Égypte ancienne*, p. 226. Cf. REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, p. 152 ff. WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 82. The shadow of Gandhi "was thought to have healing power." The Brahman threw his food away if the shadow of a pariah fell on it.

⁴ KRUYT, *Het Animisme*, p. 64.

⁵ KRUYT, *op. cit.*, p. 68. WARNECK, *Die Lebenskräfte des Evangeliums*, p. 33.

⁶ Footsteps, see Ro. 4 : 12, 2 Co. 12 : 18, 1 Pe. 2 : 21. CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 24. Primitive man regards the impressions of the body made during sitting and walking as part of his personality, in which his force is thus also active. It was believed that magic could be done with footprints. Cf. WARNECK, *op. cit.*, p. 32: "Fussspuren können durch Vermittlung des ihnen anklebenden Schweisses verzaubert werden" . . . Sweat is charged with the soul-force. Sweat-cloths and water in which distinguished persons have washed themselves are beneficial.

documented book BLOCH describes the cures said to have been performed by in particular the kings of England and France.¹ These cures related to the King's evil, *morbus regius*, *mal du roi*, viz. *scrofula* (tuberculosis of the lymphatic glands). It is said of Robert II, the Pious, the second Capetian (996-1031), that he already possessed this remarkable power of healing, which his successors inherited. This power could also be lost by sin, as happened to Philip I (1060-1108). But Louis VI (1108-1137) regularly performed cures, as did Edward the Confessor in England. In other countries, too, kings were attributed with the power of healing, such as the Hapsburgs, the house of Castile.² From the sixteenth century onwards healings were performed with the set formula: "The King touches you and God heals you."³ A detail that may be added is that William of Orange, who ascended the throne of England in 1688, refused to touch the sick.⁴ As late as 1722 more than 2000 persons sought healing in Rheims on the day after Louis XV's coronation.⁵ Although this custom has now disappeared in civilized states, belief in healing or fortification by touch persists elsewhere. Just as mothers once brought their children to Jesus to be touched by Him, mothers brought their children to the first European to visit a Punan village in Sarawak in the belief that he was the spirit of an ancestor. The mothers "bore their children to him, not only

¹ BLOCH, *Les Rois Thaumaturges*. Cf. WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. 75: "Die Berührung englischer Könige galt als heilskräftig gegen *morbus regius*, die Ungarischen heilten Gelbsucht, die der Bourgogne bewahrten vor Pest, die spanischen heilten Besessene, die französischen galten von den ältesten Zeiten an als heilskräftig." WHITE, *Histoire de la Lutte entre la Science et la Théologie*, p. 317 ff. FRAZER, *The Golden Bough*, Part I, 1, pp. 366-372.

² BLOCH, *op. cit.*, p. 151.

³ BLOCH, *op. cit.*, p. 315: "Le roi te touche et Dieu te guérit."

⁴ BLOCH, *op. cit.*, p. 390. Cf. FRAZER, *The Golden Bough*, Part I, p. 370: "On the only occasion when he was importuned into laying his hand on a patient, he said to him: 'God give you better health and more sense'." Cf. also *Aftermath*, a supplement to *The Golden Bough*, Ch. III.

⁵ BLOCH, *op. cit.*, p. 397. The following passage is worthy of mention: "En 1535, Michel Servet fit paraître à Lyon une traduction, avec notices additionnelles, de la Géographie de Ptolémée; on y lisait, parmi les suppléments, ces mots: 'On rapporte des rois de France deux choses mémorables: premièrement, qu'il existe dans l'Église de Reims un vase éternellement plein de chrême, envoyé du ciel pour le couronnement, dont tous les rois sont oints; deuxièmement que le Roi, par son seul contact, guérit les écrouelles. J'ai vu de mes propres yeux ce roi toucher plusieurs malades atteints de cette affection. S'ils furent vraiment rendus à la santé, c'est ce que je n'ai point vu'" (p. 327). As a result of the political revolutions belief in the miraculous power of Kings died out (p. 381).

to see him and to touch him, but above all to be touched by him.”¹ Touching, breathing upon, blowing, tapping, stroking, shadow and clothing, handkerchiefs and objects charged with power: all of these can be summarized under the one belief that contact with a person who is deemed to possess special powers can bring physical and spiritual salvation — or calamity! Present-day mesmerism is a frequently quoted example of this. Earlier we have broached the question of how we could picture to ourselves the “power” of Jesus and His healing touch. We have already said that Jesus never resorted to mysterious manipulations, that for instance He never touched sufferers with His foot, as Vespasian did. We nowhere read that Jesus “blew away” a disease, as an Apocryphal Gospel tells of Him.² His activities differed fundamentally from those of the magicians, who had learned a whole technique in Egypt: how demons had to be expelled, diseases blown away, heroes invoked, etc.³

When considering touching by Jesus we must not think of the discharge of an essence of power, nor of the outpouring of a sort of fluid. Nor must we seek to establish a resemblance between touching by Jesus and so-called “tactile stimuli,” as employed by present-day suggestive therapy.⁴ In our opinion an indication may be found in the Christology of the first centuries which may lead to a correct understanding of this action of Jesus. GRONDIJS has demonstrated that the Divine Person who is represented from the fifth century onwards by the symbol of a hand is the Logos or Son of God. “Not only the Epistles of Paul, but also the theology of the Apologists and the first Fathers agree on this point: it is not the Father but the Son that creates, preserves, appears.”⁵ Irenaeus speaks of the creation of Adam as being through the Word, and Athanasius says that according to Holy Writ “the Son of God himself is the Word

¹ KRUYT, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

² EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 38: “Only in the apocryphal *Ev. Thom.* Lat. c. 14 (p. 178 Tischendorf) we are informed that James, bitten by a viper, was healed by the Lord who breathed upon the wound and so killed the viper too.”

³ ORIGEN, *c. Celsum*, I, 68.

⁴ FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

⁵ GRONDIJS, *De Ikonographie*, p. 90. “When God appears in human form, He chooses that of Christ incarnate, and in such a case the artist will not depict Him otherwise than he sees Jesus teaching the multitude or healing the sick. But when God reveals Himself as a voice, as a breeze, a vision, a prophetic inspiration or a miraculous intercession, i.e. without assuming a visible form, Christian art will always depict such a revelation as a Hand, and that Hand will in all cases be the symbol of the Word” (p. 106 f.).

of God, and the wisdom, and the image, and the hand, and the power.”¹ Art was able to use only the symbol of the hand as a concrete datum. Now this identification of Word and Hand in the person of the Son of God may be explained as follows: what is said symbolically in the Old Testament about the hand of God manifests itself concretely in the New Testament in the hand of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. When Jesus touches a sick person, His immediate, creative, preserving power manifests itself in that action. The functions of His word and His hand are identical! By that touch the sick person is “linked” to Jesus, he becomes the property of Jesus, and therefore he is mentally and physically healed, i.e. “restored” within the salvation of the Kingdom of God. Christ is the Regenerator, Christ is the “Re-creator.”

(d) *The Word*

More frequent than touching is the use of the word. Just as power is concealed in the breath, there is also power in the word, which leaves the mouth of man “as part of his being.”² In all peoples the word, and in particular the magic word, therefore plays a supreme role. Confining ourselves to Israel, Judaism and Christianity, we see that in these three, too, the word plays the leading part. The Old Testament contains one continuous eulogy on the speaking of God, the Word of the Lord, as an expression of His

¹ GRONDIJS, op. cit., p. 91, with reference to Athanasius, *Epistola de decretis Nicaenae synodi*, c. 17 . . . See IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, IV, 20, 1, where Irenaeus argues that man was not made by angels but by God Himself, who has “His own hands,” viz. the Word, and the Wisdom, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Cf. IV, 20, 4: there is one God, who with His Word and His wisdom has created everything; and V, 15, 2, in which Irenaeus says that the man born blind was not healed by a word, but by an operation, so that there would be revealed therein the “hand of God,” which in the beginning formed man. In Jesus’ action the hand of God became “recognizable” to those who were capable of understanding it. TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 8, pithily remarks that Christ touched others “by laying hands—naturally so that they could not but feel it—on those on whom he conferred the benefits of medicine, just as truly, just as little fancied, as the hands by means of which he conferred them” (*Ad summam, et ipse mox tetigit alios, quibus manus imponens, utique sentiendas, beneficia medicinarum conferebat, tam vera, tam non imaginaria, quam erant per quas conferebat*).

² CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 19 f. Cf. BLAU, op. cit., p. 61 ff., on the word as a magic spell. OBBINK, *De magische betekenis van de naam in zonderheid in het oude Egypte*, Ch. I, *De naam als lichaamsdeel*. Names and words are “things”, substances with their own objective existence (p. 21) . . . “When the word is spoken, it ‘crystallizes’ itself, we might say; it is then a thing in space, which makes its existence in that space thoroughly felt” (p. 21). OBBINK illustrates this with examples from the world of the primitives and of the old civilized peoples.

creative, preserving, commanding, protective Power. PEDERSEN gives a sensitive definition of the word as follows: "The word is the form of vesture of the contents of the soul, its bodily expression. Behind the word stands the whole of the soul which created it."¹ Man as creature, who may have the use of the word, has therein, and for that reason, an almost unlimited power for good and for evil. Particularly when he knows certain words: magic words and magic spells. "More effective than herb and stone in magic is the magic spell spoken ceremoniously. Effective words have the power to kill and to bring to life, to heal and to make sick; they can change the laws of nature, burst open fetters, find treasures, compel demons; but he who would compel these must know their names," says STEPLINGER, and his words have something in them of a fearful tribute.² It was not for nothing that there appeared on an Attic tablet of imprecations: "Blessed is he that knows the spells."³ To make the conjuration more effective it was repeated (as a cursing man will repeat his oaths, "to lend more force to them!"), or the letters and syllables were reversed, in order to compel the demons or the spell to reverse themselves.⁴ Just like other peoples, Judaism also had its magic words, and according to BLAU there must in fact have been very many of them, of which only a few have been preserved. Most sayings and conjurations come from teachers of the Talmud who were also physicians.⁵ The exorcizer anointed his head with oil and the saying was whispered in the ear of the sick person, since it was thought that the saying lost some of its magic power if non-adepts heard it.⁶ The greatest power of the conjuration consisted in

¹ PEDERSEN, *Israel, its Life and Culture*, I-II, p. 167 . . . Cf. for the "Word of God" in the Old Testament the article by PROKSCH, *TWNT*, IV, p. 89 ff. DE GROOT-HULST, *Macht en Wil*, p. 51 ff.

² STEPLINGER, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

³ STEPLINGER, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

⁴ BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 147. Example: *ablana-analba*. This is the origin of the well-known magic word *ablanathanalba*.

⁵ BLAU, *op. cit.*, pp. 64, 71. REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, p. 14. Alongside Egyptian magic Jewish was found as a widespread system, according to Reitzenstein. PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 164, remarks: "Es ist sehr merkwürdig, dass von eigentlichen Beschwörungen im Talmud überhaupt keine Rede ist; desto öfter wird das 'Besprechen' (*lâchasch*), das wir wohl als stark verblasstes Abbild der Beschwörung auffassen müssen, erwähnt." BIETENHARDT, *TWNT*, V, p. 268 f., on: "Namenglaube und Namenzauber" in Jewish literature.

⁶ BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 71 . . . EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 48, explains the different techniques used by Jesus in Mk. 7 : 33, viz. the taking aside of the patient, and in Mk. 10 : 46 ff., the healing of Bartimaeus in the midst of a great number of people, by the different times and circumstances. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*,

knowing and naming a name, for the name is existence itself. It is therefore the name that opens the "way to the objective."¹ When the Babylonian sorcerer knew the "name," he had the person in his power "And therefore the name of God is the highest means of conjuration in Babylonia."² "If the magician was able to speak the right name at the right moment, he became the master of the situation, for neither gods nor demons could resist the name; if they were called, they had to appear," says BLAU.³

The pagan magicians often made use of the name of the God of Israel, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (Ex. 3 : 6), of whose wonderful power they had heard much. The name of Jesus also formed a frequent means of conjuration, see Mk. 9 : 38; Lk. 9 : 49; Ac. 19 : 13. One conjuration was: "I exorcise you by the God of the Hebrews, Jesus Iaba Iae Abraoth." ⁴ ORIGEN even claims:

sees in Mk. 7 : 33 and 8 : 23 an account of the technique of healing: the uninitiated may not have anything to do with it.

¹ See JIRKU, *Die Dämonen u. ihre Abwehr im Alten Testament*, p. 26. JEREMIAS, *Babylonisches im N.T.*, p. 104. To give a name = to create. The usage is both Babylonian and Hebrew. PEDERSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 245: "The soul in its entirety, with all its blessings and honour, finds expression in the name, *shēm* . . . It is to be understood quite literally that the name is the soul." BIETENHARDT, *TWNT*, V, p. 242 ff. FRAZER, *The Golden Bough*, Part II, Ch. VI, *Tabooed words*, § 1, *Personal names tabooed*. The link between a name and a person or a thing is not a matter of arbitrary or simple naming, "but a real and substantial bond . . . In fact, primitive man regards his name as a vital portion of himself and takes care of it accordingly" (p. 318). Cf. *Aftermath*, a supplement to the *Golden Bough*, Ch. XXIII.

² JEREMIAS, *op. cit.*, p. 105 . . . BIETENHARDT, *TWNT*, V, p. 243: "Der Name ist also eine mit seinem Träger aufs engste verbundene Potenz, die über das Wesen des Trägers Aufschluss gibt; Aussprechen oder Anrufen des Namens setzt die in ihm enthaltene potentielle Energie um in wirkende Kraft." Cf. OBBINK, *op. cit.*, p. 56 ff., Ch. 3, *De naam als machtsmiddel*.

³ BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 123 . . . Cf. PREISKER, *Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 180 f.: "Wer den Namen weiss, hat den Gott auf seiner Seite". SCHNEIDER, *Einführung i.d. Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 148. CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 10: in Palestine one always heard God's name; Bismallah, in the name of Allah, was as it were a short prayer in selfdefence. Cf. CANAAN, *Aberglaube*, p. 100. L. BAUER, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*, p. 26: "Um Menschen, Tiere, Hab und Gut vor den verderblichen Einflüssen des Satans oder böser Geister zu schützen, wird bei den verschiedensten Anlässen der Name Gottes als Schutz- und Zauberwort ausgesprochen." TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, pp. 78-103, "In the name of —."

⁴ WÜNSCH, *Antike Fluchtafeln*, p. 6. ὁρκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων Ἰησοῦ Ἰαβα Ιαη Ἀβραωθ. The conjuration is given in the Pap. Paris. 3019. Cf. NILSSON, *Die Religion in den griech. Zauberpapyri*. EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 9. SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*, III, p. 296 ff. Cf. BIETENHARDT, *TWNT*, V, p. 250 f., on "Die Zauberpapyri." "Vom 4. Jhd. an kommen auch christliche Zauberpapyri vor,

"The name of Jesus was so powerful against the demons that it sometimes occurred that his name was effective even when spoken by evil men."¹

It strikes us that, though the pagan exorcists made such frequent use of some name or the other, this was never the case with Jesus, nor do we find the slightest trace of a magic spell in His activities. "The miracles of the New Testament are performed by the word charged with power of the person of Jesus or of the disciple. This word has nothing to do with a magic spell," remarks GRUNDMANN.² The word of Jesus is the decisive factor, since it proves from this that Jesus' word is "stronger" than the spells that the demons use to defend themselves against Jesus.³ We are reminded of what the Wisdom of Solomon says about the healing of the Israelites when they were bitten by the serpents in the wilderness. The Israelites were bitten to impress God's commandments on them: "and quickly healed again, lest they lapse into deep forgetfulness and be com-

in denen ua die Namen Marias, Johannes des Täufers u der Trinität als wirkungskräftig genannt werden neben anderen voces mysticae wie Jaô, Sabaôth usw. (Preis Zaub II 190-200)" (p. 251).

¹ ORIGEN, c. Celsum, I, 6 . . . "It is clear that the Christians act without all the trouble of magic chants, but by using the name of Jesus and other reliable words in accordance with Divine Scripture" (end of I, 6). Cf. for the expulsion of demons and healing in the name of Jesus among others ORIGEN, c. Celsum, I, 67 (the name of Jesus removes unsoundness of mind from men, and demons and disease); III, 36; VIII, 58. IRENAEUS, Adv. haereses, II, 32, 4; II, 32, 5 (the name of Jesus Christ confers benefits and heals: "most assuredly and in reality all who believe in him everywhere"). EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., V, VII, 3. JUSTIN, Dial. cum Tryph., 30 (the demons tremble at the power of Christ's name), cf. cap. 131.

² GRUNDMANN, Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt, p. 66. Cf. BORNHÄUSER, Das Wirken des Christus, p. 49. The Jews accused Jesus of pronouncing the name of Beelzebub, perhaps softly. FIEBIG, Jüd. Wundergeschichten, p. 97. Jesus' originality also comes to the fore in the miracle stories: "Zaubersprüche kennt er nicht, an Zaubermitteln nur den Speichel oder die Handauflegung." SCHNEIDER, Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums, I, p. 60 f., is of the opinion that the Gospel of Mark in particular has Jesus acting as a magician. "Bei ihm wird auch die Dämonenbeschwörung wie in Zauberbüchern geschildert; der Dämon erkennt seinen Beschwörer; er fürchtet sich vor der göttlichen Macht, er droht oder bittet. Jesus als Beschwörer braucht Zaubersprüche, teils fremdsprachige, teils typisch griechische, und Zaubergesten." Schneider points to various texts; he also believes that Lk. 11 : 20 gives rise to the surmise that Jesus also used a "Zaubergerät"; "Mt. 12, 28 hat sich daran gestossen." Does Schneider really believe that Jesus manipulated a kind of "finger of God" like a magic wand? For he asks: "nach der Meinung des Lk. oder wirklich?" Most strange!

³ GRUNDMANN, op. cit., p. 70.

pletely withdrawn from Your benevolence. For it was neither a herb, nor a salve that healed them, but Your Word, O Lord, that heals everything. For You have power over life and death and take men into the depths to the portals of the underworld and back again."¹ In His healings Jesus acted in communion with and under the direction of the Father. Consequently, as the Son of God He did not need to invoke some name or the other, for the name of the Father manifested itself in His word. Sometimes it was short imperatives in which His power and His will to heal expressed themselves: "I will: be thou clean" (Mt. 8 : 3); "Go" (Mt. 8 : 32); "Arise" (Mt. 9 : 6); "Stretch forth thine hand" (Mt. 12 : 13); "Talitha cumi" (Mk. 5 : 41); "Ephphatha" (Mk. 7 : 34), etc. If we read the "conversations" accompanying the miracles, we note that Jesus went straight to the heart of the matter without much preamble. His word was efficax and "a fundamental constituent of action."² It was not a magic word — in contrast with the sorcerers' spells — but as divine word it brought salvation and healing. In short: in the word of Jesus the Kingdom of God functions, as a result of which healing is aroused, created.

(e) *Details: the look; looking up and sighing; taking aside*

1. The look. We have already written elsewhere about the power of the eye, in particular that of the evil eye.³ PEDERSEN puts it pithily when he says that when a person is looking at something, the eye is that moment the particularly active part of the soul: "Therefore the Soul *is* at that moment eye."⁴ The Gospels nowhere refer to a "healing" look or an "evil" look by Jesus. Nor can there be any

¹ Wisdom of Solomon, cap. 16 : 11-13 (see KAUTZSCH, *Die Apokr. und Pseudepigr. des Alten Testaments*, I, p. 502).

² KITTEL, TWNT, IV, p. 107 . . . With regard to the miracles of Jesus, Kittel says: "Das Wort Jesu und die Vollmacht dieses Wortes bewegt sich nicht in einer 'nur' geistigen, jenseits des Körperlichen, Naturhaften liegenden Ebene, erhebt vielmehr seinen Herrschaftsanspruch an der vollen, unverkürzten Geist-Leiblichkeit, wie sie aller von der Bibel beschriebenen Schöpfung eignet" (p. 107). BULTMANN, *Glauben u. Verstehen*, Art. "Der Begriff des Wortes Gottes im Neuen Testament," pp. 268-293. God's Word creates, directs, commands, promises. Jesus Christ is the Word; see John. "Sein ganzes Wirken löst sich auf in das Wort; seine Werke sind seine Worte, seine Worte seine Werke" (p. 290). Cf. VRIEZEN, *Hoofddlijnen der Theologie v.h. O.T.*, on God's revelatory word. "The Word that reveals does not only proclaim salvation, but also brings it near, realizes it. The revelation of God is efficax, brings something about (Ps. 19 : 8 f.)" (p. 250).

³ See the chapter: *Miracles and Medicine*.

⁴ PEDERSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 176 . . . Cf. Ps. 109 : 4, *וְאֲנִי תַפְלֵה*: "but I [give myself into] prayer", in which action and being are identified with one another.

question of an evil look by Paul in Ac. 13 : 9, since this is contradicted by the statement that he was filled with the Holy Ghost. CLEMEN considers it possible that Peter's "fastening his eyes upon him," Ac. 3: 4, might be described as a "good" look.¹ But in the healing related there, too, the all-important thing is the power of the word: "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk."

2. Looking up and sighing. On a few occasions it is stated that Jesus looked up to heaven, viz. in the healing of the deaf and dumb man, Mk. 7 : 34, and in the feeding of the five thousand, Mt. 14 : 19 and parallel passages. Some believe that this looking up formed part of the technique of healing. DIBELIUS calls the look mentioned in Mk. 7 : 34 one that calls for power and brings down power from above.² He also regards the "sighing" of Jesus, which the Evangelist mentions in the same text between "looking up" and the command "Ephphatha," as a means forming part of the healing.

On the basis of a number of magic spells DIBELIUS comes to the conclusion that sighing is part of "the mystical magical technique. The look and heavy breathing — called sighing by men — are means of recovering power."³ Are the looking up and sighing of Jesus in fact part of this pattern? Although in Judaism the eye and the heart were as a rule directed towards the holy of holies in the temple,⁴ looking up to heaven in prayer occurs in both the Old Testament and the New Testament.⁵ When Jesus thanks the Father before

¹ CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 22.

² DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 82. Cf. p. 87: "Bei der Speisung sind Blick zum Himmel und Segensspruch wunderkräftige Mittel." KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*.

³ DIBELIUS, *op. cit.*, p. 82 f. . . . Dibelius invokes the following texts: "Im grossen Pariser Zauberpapyrus (Preisendanz, *Papyri Magicae*, 1928, S. 150) heisst es Zeile 2492 nach Beendigung eines Zaubergebetes: 'Wirf Rauchwerk ins Feuer, seufze und steige rückwärts hinab (vom Dach) und alsbald wird sie kommen.' Im Leidener Papyrus W (Dieterich, *Abraxas* 202, 15 f.) stehen in einer solchen Anweisung die Worte 'ziehe ein, erfülle dich mit geschlossenen Augen, brülle, so viel du kannst, dann seufze und lasse pfeifend die Luft wieder heraus.' In Dieterichs sogenannter Mithrasliturgie finden sich in ähnlichem Zusammenhang die Worte S. 6, 4: 'hole von den Strahlen Atem, dreimal einziehend so stark du kannst' oder S. 10, 23 'ziehe von dem Göttlichen gerade hinblickend in dich den Geisthauch' . . .'. Dibelius wishes to compare the sighing of Jesus with the breathing technique of the thaumaturges, in fact for him it is a "certainty": "dass auch dieser Seufzer ein Mittel der Heilung ist."

⁴ STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 246; IV, 1, p. 227 ff.

⁵ Cf. Ps. 121 : 1 (unto the hills); Ps. 123 : 1; Lk. 18 : 13; Jn. 17 : 1; Ac. 7 : 55. EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 44: "The heaven-directed gaze at prayer and sacrifice is, whenever the deity invoked inhabits the superior regions, per se just as natural in Palestine as elsewhere."

the resuscitation of Lazarus, He lifts up His eyes, Jn. 11 : 41. But here there can be no question of "bringing down power from above," for Jesus thanks the Father for having heard Him! Why should Mk. 7 : 34 and Mt. 14 : 19 have to relate to technique? Jesus' attitude here may be regarded in the same way as in Jn. 17 : 1. We should like to say the same with regard to sighing. We must interpret the words: "and looking up to heaven, he sighed" as a whole, viz. as the "sighing" of the prayer, the sighing that accompanied the concealed communion of Jesus with the Father.¹ If this looking up and sighing had been permanent technical aspects of the *modus operandi* of Jesus, we should definitely find references to them in the literature of early Christianity, but what we find there is that it is repeatedly stated that healing was simply performed only "in the name of Jesus!"

3. Taking aside. It is also considered to be part of the pattern of the technique of healing that Jesus took the sick man aside from the multitude, Mk. 7 : 33. It has been asserted that the sick man was taken aside to keep the process of healing secret from the unauthorized.² But why should Jesus have applied this method one time and not another? We must therefore not regard this procedure as a technical action, but must seek the reason for it elsewhere. Various motives have been envisaged. Jesus did not want to create a sensation;³ He took the man aside because the external actions might have been regarded as witchcraft;⁴ He sought silence on account of the condition of the man;⁵ He wanted to avoid large-scale healings,⁶ etc. However,

¹ EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 44, after pointing to the parallels from the *papyri magicae*, says: "Jesus, however, 'sighs' in fervent attachment and devoted dependence on his Father's will. It is a simple 'silent prayer,' as we should say. As we see, it is an expression just as natural in cult as in magic." KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*: "Jesus looks up to heaven to pray; his sigh is a silent prayer." VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*: "sighing is the expression of a strong emotion." HAUCK, *Markus*: looking up to heaven means to the sick man that the aid must come from God.

² KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*; cf. Mk. 8 : 23; Ac. 9 : 40; Mk. 5 : 40; 1 Ki. 17 : 19; 2 Ki. 4 : 33. MEYER, *TWNT*, V, p. 586, with reference to Klostermann: "offenbar zum Zwecke der 'Geheimhaltung des Heilungsprozesses vor Unberufenen'."

³ GOULD, *St. Mark*. "Jesus avoided publicity in all his miracles, but especially in this period of retirement."

⁴ KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*.

⁵ GOULD, *St. Mark*. Jesus wanted to arouse the man's concentration. See also note 117; GOULD combines two motives.

⁶ BRUCE in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. Bruce calls this "the true reason, doubtless." BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 239, states as reason: "dass man das Wunder nicht schauen, die Gottheit nicht beim

these are all suppositions. We can only say that Jesus followed the method that He considered the correct one in certain circumstances and having regard to the persons involved. Those who believe that Jesus was guided in His methods by a technique of healing, or that the New Testament authors incorporated this technique in the healing miracles, force upon the Gospels elements which are essentially foreign to them.

(f) *Healing at a distance*

A few accounts tell of healing at a distance. The story of the healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum ends with the words: "Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour," Mt. 8 : 13.

Lk. 7 : 10 reads: "And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole that had been sick." In the account of the healing of the nobleman's son the wonderful process of healing is dwelt on at length. "Jesus saith unto him, Go thy way; thy son liveth. And the man believed the word that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way. And as he was now going down, his servants met him, and told him, saying, Thy son liveth. Then inquired he of them the hour when he began to amend. And they said unto him, Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him. So the father knew that it was at the same hour, in the which Jesus said unto him, Thy son liveth: and himself believed, and his whole house," Jn. 4 : 50-53. The story of the healing of the daughter of the woman of Canaan ends with: "Then Jesus answered and said unto her, O woman, great is thy faith: be it unto thee even as thou wilt. And her daughter was made whole from that very hour," Mt. 15 : 28. Compare Mk. 7 : 29-30: "And he said unto her, For this saying go thy way; the devil is gone out of thy daughter. And when she was come to her house, she found the devil gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed."

Understandably much attention has been devoted at all times to this healing "at a distance." Must this be accepted as it stands, or should one rather think of a fortuitous coincidence or perhaps of a natural course of events? The rationalists see few if any difficulties in these stories. PAULUS remarks with reference to Lk. 7 : 10 that those returning seem to have lingered a while to listen to Jesus

Werke sehen darf," cf. Judg. 3 : 19 ff.; Gen. 19 : 14-16; Gen. 19 : 26. "Das Motiv wird dann freilich unverstanden weitergeschleppt und wird zum konventionellen Zuge."

speak, whilst the two apostles sent to give aid by Jesus were already on their way to the sick person. "The fact that the dispatching of the intermediaries is not explicitly stated remains a curtailment." But it is quite evident from Lk. 7 : 8, cf. Mt. 8 : 13. The Evangelists could not have suspected that it would later be exaggerated, or "they would have tried to prevent this" (!).¹ The same course of events must be assumed in the healing of the daughter of the woman of Canaan. What really happened therefore seems to have been the following. Whilst Jesus outwardly had been obliged to appear hard on the woman, He had already sent one of the apostles, who had taken action against demons at an earlier date, to heal the girl before the mother hoped for this. "Though unkind in words, he was all the more helpful in deed."² And as far as the healing of the nobleman's son is concerned, the nobleman "naturally" told Jesus how ill his son was, so that Jesus knew that the boy would recover. There was thus no miracle at all, says PAULUS, but "a correct forecast of the healing! Not even a cure."³

To VON AMMON things are even simpler. With regard to the healing of the centurion's servant he remarks that there is nothing out of the ordinary in the rapid alleviation of the sick servant after a violent attack of rheumatic fever in the vicinity of a lake, and the Evangelist himself describes the change in this condition in such moderate terms "that he can hardly have thought of anything supernatural." Consequently there is not the slightest reason to think of mesmeric clairvoyance or of the healing coinciding with the word of Jesus.⁴ In Mt. 15 : 28 VON AMMON perceives a comforting prophecy to the woman of Canaan: "and it goes without saying that this promised nothing impossible, having regard to the youth of the sick girl and the periodicity of her illness."⁵

STRAUSS believes that he has found the solution in quite a different quarter. He compares the healing at a distance of the centurion's servant with the healing of Naaman, 2 Ki. 5 : 9 ff. Elisha healed Naaman without having had contact with him. Well now, the Messiah must surely also have been capable of healing in such a way? "And

¹ PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 716.

² PAULUS, *op. cit.*, II, p. 304.

³ PAULUS, *Commentar über das Neue Testament*, IV, 1, p. 258 ff. . . . Ad Jn. 4 : 50 Paulus remarks that the belief that the father's faith brought about the result at long range is a: "blosses Hinzudenken des Wunderbaren."

⁴ VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 366.

⁵ VON AMMON, *op. cit.*, II, p. 277.

so our New Testament story proves to be a necessary counterpart of that in the Old Testament.”¹

PAULUS, VON AMMON and STRAUSS have tried, each in his own way, to give an explanation which would not offend “rational thought.”

It is interesting to see how three doctors who have concerned themselves with the miracles of Jesus differ in their opinions.

SENG believes that from the medical point of view there is nothing to be said about this method of healing.² EBSTEIN is of the opinion that the quiet manner in which Jesus spoke to the master of the servant had a salutary effect on the sick man himself.³ DE RÉGLA, who holds the view that all miracles are based on hypnosis and suggestion, claims that the belief of the centurion was a force which concentrated His activity.⁴

As is known, healing at a distance by Jesus was not a unique feat, since this power was and is also attributed to others. The following strange account of a healing in the temple of Aesculapius at Epidaurus has been preserved. “Arate of Laconia. Dropsy. On account of her, her mother slept, whilst she [herself] was in Lacedaemon, and saw a dream: she dreamed that the deity cut off her daughter’s head and hung up the body with the neck downwards; when much liquid had flowed out, he took down the body and replaced the head on the neck. After she had seen this dream, she returned to Lacedaemon and found her daughter healthy; she had seen the same dream.”⁵ To a certain extent one can speak here of healing at a distance, but the account certainly differs from those in the New Testament! The case is different with an account from the Talmud. This contains traits strongly reminiscent of the healing of the centurion’s son. “Once the son of Rabbi Gamaliel fell ill. He sent two scholars to Rabbi Hanina ben Dosa to ask him to pray for him. When he saw them he went up to an upper chamber and prayed for him. When he came down he said to them: Go, the fever has left him. They

¹ STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 122 f. . . KAISER, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel*, p. 100. The healing of Naaman may be understood: “gleichsam als eine Fernwirkung.”

² SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 23.

³ EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*, p. 78. Ebstein believes that: “der Krankheitsprozess ein solcher war, dass er sich einem solchen suggestiven Heilverfahren gegenüber nicht spröde erwies.” Needless to say, it is then assumed that the sick man was aware of the talk that Jesus had had with the centurion.

⁴ DE RÉGLA, *Jésus de Nazareth*, p. 157.

⁵ HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 17; miracle 21.

said to him: Are you a prophet? He replied: I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I learnt this from experience. If my prayer is fluent in my mouth, I know that he is accepted, but if not, I know that he is rejected. They sat down and made a note of the exact moment. When they came to Rabbi Gamaliel, he said to them: By the temple service! You have not been a moment too soon or too late, but so it happened: at that very moment the fever left him and he asked for water to drink."¹

STRACK-BILLERBECK dates Gamaliel II at 90 A.D. and Ḥanina ben Dosa at 70. FIEBIG draws attention to the fact that the stories come from the same time, but is of the opinion that they are entirely independent of each other; they are connected only in that they come from the same milieu.² However, the important difference between the two accounts is that in the case of Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa a prayer is answered, whilst this is not said of Jesus. But doubtless the healing by Rabbi Ḥanina ben Dosa can be classified as a healing at a distance. Now can the statements on and various views of prayers and "forces" that work at a distance help to elucidate this method of treatment by Jesus? May we adduce all kinds of magical practices of "binding" at a distance as analogies? Some "doctors" among primitive peoples have the practice of not visiting their patients; they merely ask for the name of the sick person, take some object, name the name of the sick person and then spit on the object.³ This method might with justice be given the name of teletherapy! There is said to have been a monk who cast out devils even at a distance.⁴ Is it perhaps parapsychology that can give us the answer in this case? For what Jesus does here is paranormal, and VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN argues that the healing of the centurion's servant

¹ Berakoth 34b (ed. Epstein; transl. M. Simon) . . . Berakoth 34b: "It was related of R. Ḥanina Ben Dosa that he used to pray for the sick and say, this one will die, this one will live. They said to him: how do you know? He replied: if my prayer comes out fluently¹), I know that he is accepted, but if not, then I know that he is rejected", ²) (ed. id.).

² FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 22: "Sowohl die jüdische als die christliche Erzählung enthält jedoch so viel konkretes Detail, dass daran nicht zu denken ist, dass solche Geschichten völlig aus der Luft gegriffen sind."

³ KLUIN, *Het geestesleven der Natuurvolken*, p. 51.

⁴ OESTERREICH, *Die Besessenheit*, p. 162. Sulpicius Severus refers to this. "Er heilte nicht nur, wenn er gegenwärtig war, oder durch sein Wort, sondern auch abwesend durch Fransen seines Busskleides oder durch Briefe die Besessenen."

¹) Lit., 'is fluent in my mouth.'

²) Lit., 'he is torn.' The word, however, may refer to the prayer, meaning that it is rejected.

"is of a clearly telepathic nature," whilst he comments on Jn. 4 : 52, 53 that will and result coincide here, a reality supported by modern research.¹ We shall not go into the question of "thinking," i.e. of the "forces" of normal but concentrated or paranormal thoughts, of the possibility of influencing, controlling or even destroying people or things from a distance.² We are not going to do so because we believe — as we have already said several times — that it is absurd to try and compare Jesus' deeds with those of a person imbued with "mana," a telepath, a clairvoyant, a mesmerist or any other supernaturally gifted or "charged" person.

But we consider it equally questionable when an exegete such as SCHNIEWIND claims that it will not be difficult as such to consider probable such healings at a distance as are related in Mt. 8 : 5-13. "Something similar happens even today; many a biography tells in credible fashion that exactly at the hour at which ardent prayers were offered for a sick person (Jas. 5 : 14 ff.) this person was helped, cf. Jn. 4 : 53."³ Firstly SCHNIEWIND makes a mistake here, since he is talking about the answering of prayers, compare the answering of rabbis' prayers. Secondly it would have to be established by as it were medical protocol — think of the strict supervision at Lourdes — whether the healings (of what diseases?) were complete. For we are most chary of the phrase about the credibility of "many a biography."

Considering the whole of the explanations — we shall not deal with the allegorical ones — we believe that neither the rationalistic explanations nor those which endeavour to employ some analogy or the other are capable of giving a satisfactory solution. RENGSTORF rightly says that it is difficult for modern man to speak of healing at a distance and that this is possible "only in faith."⁴ The

¹ VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *Parapsychologie en Godsdienstig leven*, p. 65 f. MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 347. In the absence of the patient "this power seems to be communicated by telepathy."

² Cf. GEBSER, *Abendländische Wandlung*, p. 93 ff., on the power of thought and "provozierte" telepathy. Gebser recalls what W. B. Seabrook writes in his book "The Magic Island" (Chapter 4): "Weisse Männer sind in London gestorben —und die Akten darüber befinden sich in Scotland Yard—weil ein Mönch in den Gebirgen Tibets sie zum Sterben bestimmte und murmelnd in seiner fernen Zelle mitten im Himalaya sass" (p. 96). This is no ordinary transfer of will, but "gedankliche Übertragungen."

³ SCHNIEWIND, *Das NTD*, I, 1, p. 106.

⁴ RENGSTORF, *Das NTD*, I, 2, p. 83 f., re Lk. 7 : 1-10: "Über die Fernheilungen Jesu fachgemäss zu reden ist nur im Glauben möglich, weil nur der Glaubende

fact that there was a physical distance between Jesus and these sick persons does not form any real problem for anyone who believes in the authority vested in Jesus Christ. For both healing by touch and that which follows on a word spoken personally to the sick person are, in their essence, just as wonderful as the healing of those sick persons whose recovery followed on the word of Jesus: "Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee."¹ The believer who is aware of this will not regard healing at a distance as a miracle-in-a-miracle, knowing as he does that the criterion of Jesus Christ is not identical with man's yardstick and that salvation functions in its own way.

(g) *The duration of healing*

Closely connected with the methods of treatment applied by Jesus is the question relating to the results of the healings: were the latter permanent in character or not? Attention was drawn to this at quite an early stage, and it was affirmed that the healings of Jesus were permanent. EUSEBIUS refers to an apology written by a certain Quadratus and dedicated to Emperor Hadrian, in which the following appears: "The deeds of our Saviour continued to work (for they were true): those who were healed or were raised from the dead were not only seen when they were being healed and raised from the dead, but they remained present not only during the life but also after the death of the Saviour, and indeed for a considerable time, so that some have come down even to our days."² In an account by Papias it is also stated that at the time of Hadrian people were still living who had been raised from the dead by Jesus.³ EPIPHANIUS states that it has been handed down by tra-

den Masstab besitzt, dessen man hier bedarf, wenn es nicht entweder zur Leugnung des Wunders oder aber zu einer nicht weniger falschen Überwertung gerade dieses Wunders kommen soll."

¹ Cf. Mt. 8 : 13; 15 : 28; Mk. 7 : 29; Jn. 4 : 50 . . . EITREM, op. cit., p. 40, points to "binding" at a distance and to the "numerous examples from the magic of analogy. But Jesus, at any rate, bases his cure on the πίστις of the relative (heathen) present." MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 344: "Here the alleviation is wrought in response to the faith of second persons, who plead on behalf of the sufferers." KEULERS, *Mattheüs*: "Jesus' word clearly shows that He performs the miracle for the sake of the centurion's faith." PLUMMER, *St. Luke*: "Is there any difficulty in supposing that on more than one occasion Jesus healed without being present?"

² EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, IV, III, 2. Cf. IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, II, 32, 4: ". . . there have already been those who have even risen from the dead, and have continued to live among us for many years."

³ See W. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 367, with reference to Preuschen, *Antileg.* 94.

dition that Lazarus was thirty years of age when he was raised from the dead by Jesus and that he lived thereafter for another thirty years.¹ Jesus' pronouncement on the return of unclean spirits, Mt. 12 : 43-45, cf. Lk. 11 : 24-26, is believed by many to refer to the return of the disease. FENNER says that while Jesus had many results with His healings, which is evident for instance from Mk. 9 : 38, Lk. 9 : 49, Ac. 16 : 18, 19 : 13, when expelling demons He made allowance for their return, cf. Lk. 11 : 24.² WORCESTER remarks that we know nothing further about the healed and are not able to say for sure that there were no relapses. But, he says, "the relapses must have been very exceptional, otherwise we could not account for the splendor of His fame, as the Physician both of soul and body."³

FRIDRICHSEN is of the opinion that Jesus cast out the demons permanently: "he obtained a lasting result."⁴ We thus see that the same texts give rise to different conclusions. A comparison of the context of Mt. 12: 43-45 with that of Lk. 11 : 24-26 demonstrates that Matthew is concerned with the request for a sign, whilst in Luke the Beelzebub pericope precedes Jesus' pronouncement. ALLEN's view that the pericope in Matthew probably describes the state of the Jewish nation at the time of Christ seems correct to us.⁵ The concluding words of verse 45: "Even so shall it be also unto this wicked generation," which are absent from Luke, point in this direction. The whole is reminiscent of a parable.⁶ But if that is so, little if

¹ EPIPHANIUS, *Adversus haereses*, Lib. II, Tom. II, *adversus Manichaeos*, XXXIV.

² FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 87. Cf. MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 346: some healings were probably not permanent, see Mt. 12 : 43 ff. and Lk. 11 : 24 ff. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 271, remarks that Jesus' "successful cures (most of which were, perhaps, only temporary) were those effected on neurasthenics and the like." KRAUSS, art. *Jesus of Nazareth* in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, VII, p. 162: "It is difficult to estimate what amount of truth exists in the accounts of these cures, recorded about forty years after their occurrence; but doubtless the mental excitement due to the influence of Jesus was often efficacious in at least partial or temporary cures of mental illnesses." JEREMIAS, *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament*, p. 99, ad Mt. 12 : 43, Lk. 11 : 24: "Der Orientale denkt dabei insbesondere an einen Totengeist, der keine Ruhe findet."

³ WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, *Religion and Medicine*, p. 363.

⁴ FRIDRICHSEN, *Le Problème du Miracle*, p. 75.

⁵ ALLEN, *St. Matthew*. Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*. "Das Mt. 43-45a = Luc. 24-26 lediglich eine Warnung an geheilte Dämonische vor Rückfallen sei . . . wird man nicht annehmen."

⁶ Cf. KEULERS, *Mattheüs*. Keulers sees the point of comparison in Jesus' pronouncement that the last state of that man is worse than the first. "If the

anything may be concluded from these verses in Matthew about the possible return of possession. The context in Luke is different. This is concerned with the banishing of devils by Jesus and the Jewish exorcists. In our opinion this must therefore not be regarded as a parable; ¹ it refers to the results of the Jewish exorcists and the work of Jesus. It is out of the question that Jesus did not know the practices of the exorcists. In our pericope He points to what happens if the results are incomplete: the temporary successes are then followed by much worse conditions. ² The point of Lk. 11 : 14-28 lies in verse 20: "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you." These words mark the advent of something quite different and new, also as regards the healings, since the reality of the Kingdom is manifest therein. The conclusion is therefore that the reference here is to the permanency of Jesus' healings in contrast with those of the exorcists. In Jesus' command: "Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him," Mk. 9 : 25, the concluding words "enter no more into him" must not be interpreted as meaning that Jesus feared a return. We also encounter such additions elsewhere. ³

Using everyday expressions, Jesus wishes in His rebuke to the unclean spirit to make it clear that the attacks from now on will be a thing of the past.

people spurn Jesus, their religious state will be much worse than it was before Jesus' coming."

¹ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, believes that the probably original parable is meant to drive home the doctrine: "dass es nicht genügt den bösen Geist auszutreiben, sondern dass man ganz mit Jesu sein (23) und Gottes Wort halten muss (28)." KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*, believes that Luke's parable has the same significance as that in Matthew. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 176 f., sees behind the pericope in Mt. and Lk. originally a parable, the meaning of which is the same as that of some Arab proverbs. Bultmann refers to A. Socin, *Arabische Sprichwörter und Redensarten*, 1878, and quotes as examples: "Er war weggegangen; da kam er zurück und brachte Maḥmud und Gillo noch mit." "Er ging weg von uns, da freuten wir uns; darauf kam ein anderer, der war schlimmer als er." Mt. 12 : 43-45 and parallel passage, according to Bultmann, were perhaps borrowed from a Jewish work; the intention is to urge the healed man to observe caution with respect to the demoniac forces.

² Cf. ALLEN, *St. Matthew*.

³ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, VIII, II, 5. VITA APOLL., IV, 20: the demon who had a lad in his power swore to Apollonius that he "would leave the lad and never enter any human being again." EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 26. In old Assyrian magic a common formula is that the evil spirit must leave and the good spirit must take its place. RIVERS, *Medicine, Magic and Religion*, p. 33 f., mentions the expulsion of epilepsy. The exorcist says: "Stroke away. Stroke down and away. Cease thou. Let the man live; do not return."

MICKLEM makes some important comments with regard to the present question. For the healings of Jesus MICKLEM looks to parallel cases in modern psychiatry, but he rejects the idea that Jesus healed by suggestion. "Were this the case we should be forced to conclude that the large majority of His cures were probably only temporary. For present-day evidence goes to show that treatment by 'suggestion' alone (whether hypnosis or otherwise) leads as a rule to much less permanent results than other forms of psychotherapy."¹ MICKLEM thus attributes a permanent character to Jesus' healings. If the healings of Jesus are regarded as human actions — even though they may be the actions of a powerful personality — the possibility of a return of the disease remains. If they are regarded as divine actions, as signs of the break-through of the Kingdom of God, the idea of a rapid return of the disease is difficult to reconcile with this; but we should be entering the realm of fantasy if we were to pass definite judgment on the further state of health of those healed by Jesus.² The Gospels state that those who were afflicted by some disease or the other were healed of that disease by Jesus. They nowhere say that people came to Jesus to complain about incomplete recovery, return of the disease, or anything else. Any further research brings us no further than suppositions.

¹ MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 132. This view held by Micklem is contested by BROOKS-CHARLES, *De genezingen van Emile Coué en de wonderen van Jezus*, p. 36.

² BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, makes the excellent comment that the miracles of Jesus did not mean a "Wohlfahrtsprogramm" with the aid of supernatural forces. Those who were present at the miraculous feeding were hungry again thereafter: "und die von ihm Geheilten früher oder später an derselben oder an einer anderen Krankheit — und es werden auch die von ihm vom Tod Erweckten irgend einmal endgültig gestorben sein." There is no "Kontinuität." "Sein Wohltun wird nicht zur Institution. Es begründet kein Lourdes und kein Möttlingen" (p. 240).

PART FOUR

THE MIRACLES OF JESUS
COMMENTARY

1) THE HEALING MIRACLES

I. THE HEALING OF THE POSSESSED

(a) BELIEF IN DEMONS

1. *Conceptions of the origin and essence of demons*

The Gospels repeatedly state that the multitude marvelled and glorified God when Jesus had cast out devils. The banishing of demons stirred the man of those days in his entire being, whereas it barely if at all affects modern man any more. For the great masses, belief in the actual existence of demons is something that belongs in the enormous repository of religious antiquities.

In an earlier chapter we have pointed out that belief in good and evil spirits is universal and that it played and still plays a part in the tensions and conflicts between theology and medical science. In its theological and anthropological aspect demonology affects the faith, thought and experience of all humanity.

According to VAN DER LEEUW, the origin of belief in demons is vested in an experience which, in some way or the other, "entails a thrill of fear." VAN DER LEEUW makes a distinction between three origins:

- (a) an experience from nature;
- (b) an experience from the world of dreams;
- (c) disease, madness and ecstasy.¹

The evil spirit might then be regarded as a projection, a personified fear, caused by feelings of loneliness, of being overwhelmed (nature), sensations of unfamiliarity and terror (dream, nightmare) and despair (disease). The projection acquires the form of an object; it proceeds to "possess" man, as for instance technology has for countless become an object possessing man in its "demoniac" power.

¹ VAN DER LEEUW, RGG, II, col. 959 ff., cf. id., *Phänomenologie*, p. 117 ff. JIRKU, *Die Dämonen u. ihre Abwehr im A.T.*, p. 95: reflection on the various phenomena of natural life was for Israel the cause of belief in demons . . . JASPERS, *Wijsgerig geloof*, p. 117: "The original demonology, like the myth, was the historical form of an existentially experienced reality. The observation of demons meant active concern with them, meant struggle or surrender." Jaspers condemns the reappearance of demonology in our days and tersely says: "There are no such things as demons" (p. 118).

Fear and danger are closely bound up with one another. The word fear is derived from the old English word *fæer*, which also means danger. In his terror man "sees" the danger bearing down on him, it seizes him like an evil force, as if a demon has taken him by surprise. We shall go no further here into the question of the origin of belief in demons: we are concerned with the fact that it exists, in both advanced and backward peoples.¹

The derivation of the word demon (*daimon*) is uncertain. Perhaps it is connected with the Greek verb meaning to distribute, divide, tear apart, and means "corpse-eater," which would also explain the connection with animistic conceptions. At any event the demon is a "supernatural force."² To the Greeks the word demon had at first a positive ring; the gods, particularly the minor ones, were called demons. The people mainly believed demons to be the spirits of the departed, which facilitated the transition to ghosts and evil

¹ Cf. BERKELBACH VAN DER SPENKEL, *Vrees en religie*. FREUD, *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psychoanalyse*, p. 438 ff., XXV. *Vorlesung, Die Angst*. Freud rightly remarks: "Bei welchen Gelegenheiten, d.h. vor welchen Objekten und in welchen Situationen die Angst auftritt, wird natürlich zum grossen Teil von dem Stande unseres Wissens und von unserem Machtgefühl gegen die Aussenwelt abhängen. Wir finden es ganz begreiflich, dass der Wilde sich vor einer Kanone fürchtet und bei einer Sonnenfinsternis ängstigt, während der Weisse, der das Instrument handhaben und das Ereignis vorhersagen kann, unter diesen Bedingungen angstfrei bleibt" (p. 440). See for the concept of projection the study by SIERKSMA, *De religieuze projectie*. "Religious projection is always at the same time defence against and conquest of the unknown, the superior in power" (p. 190). "The particularly great anthropological significance of the organ of sight emerges clearly in religion. When the psychical is objectified in religion, this is in the majority of cases a visual objectification. The history of religions is the richest and most fantastic 'picture book' that one can imagine" (p. 191). Looking at it in this way, one might call the demons the darkest pictures in this "book".

² FOERSTER, *TWNT*, II, p. 2. The basis of the word *δαίμων* is the root *ΔΑΙ*; *δαίωμαι* = assign, endow. "Vielleicht hat W. Porzig (Indogerm. Forschungen 41 (1923) 169/73) recht, wenn er an das Zerteilen, Zerreißen, denkt und *δαίμων* als den Leichenfresser auffasst; dies würde der animistischen Grundlage der gesamten Vorstellung wohl entsprechen . . . Jedenfalls hat schon in der ältesten uns erkennbaren Zeit *δαίμων* etwas Unfassbareres als *Θεός*. Sein gesamter Sprachgebrauch lässt sich dahin zusammenfassen, dass *δαίμων* eine übermenschliche Macht bezeichnet." Cf. KAUPPEL, *Die Dämonen im A.T.*, p. 1. According to PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 430, *δαίμων* comes from the verb *δαίειν*, i.e. to be highly mobile. SMIT, *De Daemoniacis*, p. 157, believes that *δαίμων* (= *δαήμων*) may be derived from *δάω*, to know, or from *δαίω*, to share. DE JONG, *Demonische Ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel*, considers it not impossible that the word *δαίμων* is derived from *Dim-me*, i.e. a Babylonian group of demons. *Dim-me* is a corruption of the Sumerian *Dingir*: god (p. 29; cf. p. 70 ff.).

spirits.¹ Gradually the gulf between deity and demon widened. Judaism, Christianity and Islam all see in the demon only a force inimical to God and to man. Just as the angel, as a good spirit, belongs to the realm of light, the Kingdom of God, so the demon belongs to the realm of darkness, the Kingdom of Satan.

Once belief in demons exists somewhere, it goes without saying that ultimately a doctrine will develop in which all kinds of details of these beings appear; theories arise about their origin, essence, form and rank, about where they live, about times at which they prefer to appear, about their knowledge and power. It is noteworthy that in the religions of Babylonia and Egypt we encounter a well-defined demonology,² whilst in Old Israel we can only find traces here and there of belief in evil spirits; at least there is no elaborate doctrine. However, this situation changes after the fall of Jerusalem. As a result of the foreign influences, which increase after the Exile, the number of evil spirits also steadily grows and in later Judaism we encounter a host of demons.³

We find various conceptions of the *origin* of demons. According

¹ FOERSTER, TWNT, II, p. 1 ff. LANGTON, *Essentials of Demonology*, p. 85 ff. Cf. OESTERREICH, *Die Besessenheit*, p. 152 ff. FREUD, *Totem u. Tabu*, p. 68 ff. Freud regards demons as projections of inimical sentiments which the living harbour against the dead. This primitive psychical attitude has acquired an ambivalent character: on the one hand there is the fear of demons, on the other ancestor worship. Cf. ROHDE, *Psyche*.

² KAUFEL, *Die Dämonen im A.T.*, p. 3 ff.: "Im Nillande brauchte also der Dämonenglaube mit seinen Anhängseln nicht das Tageslicht zu scheuen, er gehörte in den Rahmen der Religion hinein" (p. 5). Cf. JAMES, *The Nature and Function of Priesthood*, p. 49 ff. SIGERIST, *A History of Medicine*.

³ Cf. FOERSTER, TWNT, II, p. 10 ff.; DUHM, *Die bösen Geister im A.T.*, p. 63. CLEMEN, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N.T.*, p. 86. GUIGNEBERT, *The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus*, p. 104: "The Jewish demonology . . . was, as a whole and in its essence, the result of contamination during the Persian period." LANGTON, *op. cit.*, p. 63 ff. STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, I, p. 522. Jewish monotheism managed to make the Persian daevas subordinate to God. But it seemed as if the demons acted independently and without restraint. The matter was not always subjected to deep thought. BEEK, *Inleiding in de Joodse apocalyptiek*, p. 100. F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 124. OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 145, points out that the demonology of the Babylonians and Assyrians influenced Judaism via the Exile; in turn Judaism influenced Christianity, as a result of which the Europe of the Middle Ages was infected. Cf. MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 357; BULTMANN, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen*, p. 173. VRIEZEN, *Hoofddlijnen der Theologie v.h. O.T.*, p. 237 ff. "In the direct relationship of God and man there is hardly room for heavenly intermediaries, except in the later period of an ever-stronger transcendence of God" (p. 238). NOACK, *Satanas u. Soteria*, p. 12 ff. KÖHLER, *Theologie des A.T.*, pp. 144-147. "Im AT ist es leer um Jahwe" (p. 147).

to the Book of Enoch the devils were originally the sons of gods. Enoch describes in detail the fall of the angels. In the days of Jared 200 sons of heaven came down to Mount Hermon, enflamed by desire for the fair daughters of earth, cf. Gen. 6 : 1 ff. They taught the women charms and spells, and instructed them in the cutting of roots and the finding of medicinal herbs.¹ The importance of this account lies in the fact that it clearly illustrates the link between demons and witchcraft. The view that demons are fallen angels keeps on returning. ORIGEN, for instance, says: "Regarding the devil and his angels and the opposing forces, whilst it is true that the Church has preached that they exist, it has not explained with sufficient clarity what they are and how they exist. Most, however, hold the following opinion, that the devil was an angel and, having become an apostate, persuaded as many angels as he could to secede with him, and that these are called his own angels unto the present day."² We find the same idea in THOMAS AQUINAS, who argues that there are no demons by nature, but that they were originally good angels, who fell through their own fault. They are therefore not evil by nature, but whilst in good angels the will is affirmed in good, in bad angels the will has hardened into evil.³ CALVIN warns against the curiosity of those who would like to know how the fall of the devil and his henchmen happened. According to CALVIN, we must not busy ourselves with unnecessary things, but must be content "that we briefly know, concerning the nature of devils, that in their first creation they were angels of God, but by degeneration ruined themselves and became instruments in the ruin of others."⁴ Besides

¹ (Aeth.) ENOCH, cap. 6-11. ENOCH cap. 15 is called the locus classicus for the fall of the angels. Cf. Jubilees, cap. 10. GUIGNEBERT, op. cit., p. 101: "The theory that the demons are really fallen angels comes to our notice first in the Book of Enoch."

² ORIGEN, De Principiis, Praefatio 6: "De diabolo et angelis eius contrariisque virtutibus ecclesiastica praedicatio docuit, quoniam sunt quidem haec; quae autem sint, aut quomodo sint, non satis clare exposuit. Apud plurimos tamen ista habetur opinio, quod angelus fuerit iste diabolus, et apostata effectus quamplurimos angelorum secum declinare persuaserit, qui et nunc usque angeli ipsius nuncupantur." Cf. TERTULLIAN, Ad Nationes, II, 13: the demons are the "offspring of fallen angels" (—daemones, malorum angelorum proles—).

³ THOMAS AQUINAS, Summa Theologiae I, qu. LXI-LXIV.

⁴ CALVIN, Institut., I, XIV, 16: "Ergo, ne supervacui ipsi immoremur, contenti simus hoc breviter habere de diabolorum natura, fuisse prima creatione Angelos Dei: sed degenerando se perdidisse, et aliis factos esse instrumenta perditionis." Calvin refers to 2 Pe. 2 : 4 and Jude, V. 6, and concludes from 1 Tim. 5 : 21 that Paul sets the fallen angels "covertly" against the elect angels. Cf. also Jub.

this conception of the origin of demons we encounter the view that the creation of the shedim or mazziqin — certain evil spirits — took place on the sixth day. God was just about to make a body for their souls when the Sabbath dawned and the work was never completed. This is why the demons remained without body.

A following theory is that some of the builders of the Tower of Babel were transformed into shedim as a punishment. It is also believed that the spirits, shedim and ghosts, are the results of Adam's sexual intercourse with female spirits and that of Eve with male spirits.¹ CANAAN states that the present inhabitants of Palestine — Canaan wrote his book in 1929 — ascribe the origin of demons and groups of demons to various causes. Fire demons came forth out of fire. God created man from clay, the angels from light and the demons from fire. For that reason care must be taken with fire.² A second view is that the demons have their origin in the souls of the departed. A third is that the evil spirits are outcast angels. The first was Iblis, who refused to bow to Adam and was expelled from paradise for that reason. Since then Iblis and the evil spirits — the djinn — have persecuted man. Then many demons are believed to owe their existence to Eve, who brought forty children into the world every time she gave birth, but repudiated half of them from shame every time. These repudiated children, who were hidden beneath the surface of the earth, became demons. This Palestinian belief in demons is a mingling of Jewish and Mohammedan ideas. We thus find various theories about the origin of evil spirits.

As regards their *essence*, we everywhere encounter the same idea, viz. that as evil spirits they are impelled solely by a malignant urge to torment and to exterminate mankind. It is true that they are spirits, and yet they have material traits. According to the Talmud, the demons have six properties. In three properties they resemble the angels: they have wings, they fly around everywhere and they possess fore-knowledge. In three properties they resemble men:

5 : 1. K. BARTH, K.D., III, 3, p. 622 f., is definitely opposed to the doctrine of a "fall of angels." "Sie ist eine von den bösen Träumen der alten Dogmatik." The "Nichtige" has no foundation. Neither the devil nor the demons were ever in heaven.

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, I, p. 507. The intercourse of the serpent with Eve was also said to have created the evil spirits. Cf. DE BOER in Waszink et al., "Het oudste Christendom," I, p. 513.

² CANAAN, Dämonenglaube, p. 5. For the fire demon causes epilepsy.

they eat and drink, propagate themselves and are mortal.¹ CANAAN tells us that belief in demons eating and drinking is still extant: they consume food over which the name of God has not been spoken. Hence the frequent use of the Bismallah, "the big word," which is nothing more than a short apotropaic and protective prayer. Christians and Mohammedans further believe that demons "borrow" items of clothing; as a protection against this needles are often inserted in clothing or a "Bismallah" is pronounced as they are put away. Some people have claimed to have "seen" the spirits with clothing belonging to acquaintances.²

Demons ensnare unsuspecting man in all kinds of *forms and shapes*, especially those of the forces of nature and animals.³ We also find this view in Israel. Besides the *elohim*, the spirits of the dead,⁴ who must be guarded against,⁵ we find various evil spirits: the

¹ See EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*, p. 174 . . . APULEIUS, *De Deo Socratis*, says that the demons have a certain weight, so as not to rise too high or sink too low (*Habeant igitur haec daemonum corpora et modicum ponderis, ne ad superna incedant; et aliquid levitatis, ne ad inferna praecipitentur*). Like human beings, demons are susceptible to disorders. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Excerpta ex Scriptis Theodoti*, XIV, 1: "The demons are called bodiless, (*ἀσώματα*) but not as if they had no bodies. For they do have a form, (*σχήμα*). And therefore they are also conscious of chastisement. And yet they are called bodiless, for they are shades in comparison with the spiritual bodies that are saved. The angels, too, have bodies. At least they are seen." AUGUSTINE, *De Divinatione Daemonum*, likewise describes demons as bodies living in the air (*aërii corporis*). They are vastly quicker than men, animals and birds, as a result of which they also know things and messages before men (*multa ante cognita praenuntiant vel nuntiant, quae homines pro sensus terreni tarditate mirentur*, III, 7). They often bring disease and on account of their subtle way of life they penetrate human bodies invisibly and unobserved (*miris et invisibilibus modis per illam subtilitatem suorum corporum corpora hominum non sentientium penetrando*, V, 9) . . . See THOMAS, *Summa Theologiae*, I, qu. CIX, on ranks among the fallen angels.

² CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 8 ff. "Ein Unterschied zwischen den guten und bösen Geistern ist der, dass die letzteren sich verheiraten, Kinder erzeugen und sterben, während die ersten diese Eigenschaften nicht besitzen" (p. 21).

³ CANAAN, *op. cit.*, p. 12 ff. The wolf is the demons' greatest enemy; his shape is never assumed by the spirits. The black dog is a demon. Evil spirits lodge themselves in black animals, good spirits in white ones.

⁴ See 1 Sa. 28. See JIRKU, *Die Dämonen*, p. 1 ff.

⁵ We have preferred to formulate this cautiously in the manner chosen. DUHM, *Die bösen Geister im A.T.*, p. 21, points to Deu. 21 : 1-9; 21 : 22 f.; 26 : 14, and envisages injurious demons. Likewise JIRKU, *Die Dämonen und ihre Abwehr im A.T.*, p. 15. He sees in Deu. 21 : 22 f., Jos. 8 : 29 and 2 Sa. 18 : 17 references to defence. KAUPEL, *Die Dämonen im A.T.*, p. 21, rejects this idea: the executed man hangs to his shame. Cf. GALLING, *Bibl. Reallexikon*, col. 240, on the death cult.

shedim, i.e. the violent ones,¹ the seirim, literally the "hairy ones," spirits of the field in the form of goats,² and other desert spirits.³ The snake has long been considered a diabolic creature.⁴ DUHM believes that ostriches were also regarded as demoniac animals.⁵ Alukah was a female, blood-sucking demon of the night.⁶ At quite an early date Lilith played a role; according to DUHM Lilith was a night ghost, whilst in Jirku's opinion we are concerned here with the Babylonian female demon Lilitu, a storm spirit.⁷

However, there are not only all kinds of demons but, just as there is such a thing as *rank* and division of labour among good spirits, see the book of Enoch, so there is among evil spirits under the

¹ DUHM, op. cit., p. 20, says that in Deu. 32 : 17 שְׂדִים are definitely meant. JIRKU, op. cit., p. 40, also mentions Ps. 106 : 37. According to KAUFEL, op. cit., p. 12, שְׂדִים are also meant in Hos. 12 : 11. Cf. T. H. ROBINSON in Die zwölf kleinen Propheten, HzAT, 1938, who translates: "Dämonen haben sie geopfert." However, this reading is doubted, cf. A. v. HOONACKER, Les douze petits prophètes, 1908. LANGTON, op. cit., p. 51. Compare these spirits with the Babylonian and Assyrian ones. "The Shêdim are frequently portrayed in the form of winged bulls and as guarding the entrances to temples." Cf. p. 17 ff.

² See Lev. 17 : 7, שְׂעִירִים; Isa. 13 : 21; 34 : 14; 2 Ch. 11 : 15. Cf. DUHM, op. cit., p. 46; JIRKU, op. cit., p. 35; LANGTON, op. cit., p. 39 f.

³ Cf. Isa. 34 : 14, צִיִּים. In the LXX שְׂעִירִים, שְׂדִים, צִיִּים, אֱלִילִים (Ps. 96 : 5) and נֶדַר (Isa. 65 : 11) are usually translated by δαίμονιον. KAUFEL, op. cit., p. 8 ff. . . . On Azazel, אֶזַזֶּל, Lev. 16, opinions are divided. See LANGTON, op. cit., p. 43 ff. Many regard him as a pagan demon. GUIGNEBERT, The Jewish World, p. 100: "Possibly he is to be looked upon as the prince of the seirim (= goats), spirits of the desert, to whom sacrifices were offered in the pre-exiled period." KAUFEL, op. cit., p. 81 ff., sees in Azazel the opposite number of God, a satanic figure, and therefore not a pagan demon.

⁴ Cf. Nu. 21 : 4-9; Isa. 14 : 29; 30 : 6. See DUHM, op. cit., p. 5 ff.; JIRKU, op. cit., p. 50 ff.

⁵ See Isa. 13 : 21 יַעֲנָה; 34 : 13; Jer. 50 : 39 (the translation in the Authorized Version is "owl"). DUHM, op. cit., p. 47 f.

⁶ Pro. 30 : 15, צִלְקֻנָּה. DUHM, op. cit., p. 52: "Im Arabischen ist 'aluq ein femininischer Spezialname für Geister." JIRKU, op. cit., p. 55. LANGTON, op. cit., p. 50: "A belief in such vampire-like demons is common to many peoples."

⁷ Isa. 34 : 14, לִילִית. DUHM, op. cit., p. 51; JIRKU, op. cit., p. 37. HÖLSCHER, Das Buch Hiob, translates Job 18 : 15: "Es haust der 'Nachtmar' in seinem Zelte," i.e. the storm demon Lilitu. FOERSTER, TWNT, II, p. 11. CANAAN, Dämonenglaube, p. 48, points to belief in this demon among Jews, Christians and Mohammedans. LANGTON, op. cit., p. 47 f. According to rabbinical literature, Lilith was the demon of night par excellence. She was usually depicted as winged, with long wavy hair.

leadership of Satan. ¹ See Mt. 12 : 45, which speaks of "seven other spirits more wicked than himself."

The *homes* chosen by demons are mainly inhospitable and frightening places. A favourite place of residence is the desert. ² Water (sea and wells), ³ the wind, ⁴ graves ⁵ and ruins are also favoured. Demons further live in the air; in fire (CLEMEN believes that there are traces of fireworshipping in Lk. 9 : 54; 17 : 29; Ac. 2 : 19; 7 : 30; He. 1 : 7, etc.); ⁶ in trees, especially in the fig tree and the carob, in the shade of which demons like to gather; on mountains and dung-heaps; in caves and caverns; at crossroads, by doors, gates and under thresholds; in lavatories, etc. ⁷ In other words, all possible places which man fears to some extent or where he may suspect a danger are believed to be populated by evil spirits which may attack him unexpectedly.

Although this attack may occur at any time, there are nevertheless certain *times and days* which the demons prefer. Night is the demons' favourite time. And yet there are also morning and afternoon demons, of whom the *keṭeb*, the consuming and devouring afternoon demon, is greatly feared. ⁸ Fridays, but also Wednesdays, are still believed to be dangerous in the Middle East. "Friday is the only day of the week in which all demons are free for the full twenty-four hours," says CANAAN. ⁹ This belief was still universal in the Palestine of Canaan's day, and therefore all kinds of precautionary measures were taken on Fridays.

As a supernatural force the demon possesses a supernatural *know-*

¹ See Enoch 69 : 2-25, in which the names of the spirits are given and the ruin they brought down on men. Cf. CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 29, on the classes among the djinn. These classes are ruled by demon princes. See also G. HÖLSCHER, *Das Buch Hiob*, with reference to Job 18 : 14 on "the king of terrors."

² Cf. Mt. 12 : 43 and parallel passage; Lk. 8 : 29.

³ Cf. CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 30 ff.

⁴ See STEMPFLINGER, *op. cit.*, p. 20 f.

⁵ Mk. 5 : 2.

⁶ CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 43.

⁷ See STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, I, p. 515. According to the Greek Poseidonios the sublunary sphere was filled with demons; cf. REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, p. 70, note 1. A. JEREMIAS, *Babylonisches im N.T.*, p. 94 f. The demons live in the desert; the Cabalists call Satan the "prince of the desert". Cf. also JIRKU, *op. cit.*; CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube* . . . Andrew once freed a town gate in a town in Bithynia from demons who were blocking the traffic, see HENNECKE, *Neutestam. Apokr.*, p. 251.

⁸ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, I, p. 519.

⁹ CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 19 ff. The inhabitants of Palestine used to say: "Wednesday has an hour of misfortune and Friday is full of evil spirits," p. 20.

ledge; he knows and sees more than man. The demoniacs in the New Testament "know" who Jesus is! Such special knowledge has also been found among many other demoniacs. THOMAS AQUINAS sees this as follows. Both God and good and evil spirits possess an intellect exceeding that of man. Consequently the demons know a good deal as a result of their natural knowledge that is unknown to ordinary man but which they can make known to him.¹ CALVIN, who violently opposes the view that demons are no more than evil passions generated in us by our own flesh, calls devils "spirits gifted with senses and intellect."²

In a following section the supranormal knowledge of the possessed will be discussed.

2. *The effect of demons*

A man who believes in the existence of demons will also be capable of stating what proof he has for that belief, or at any rate what intimation he has of it. For fundamentally it is only man who can assert that a natural force, a man, an animal, a tree or a plant, an object, has been possessed by a demon. He will notice something — or think that he notices something — falling outside the ordinary run of things; he will be struck by certain matters and events and will suspect the workings of a mysterious evil power behind them: unusual outbursts of the forces of nature, a lunatic, a mad dog, a deformed plant, a hot spring, an object out of the ordinary, etc.

But the most striking form is that of human possession, which we find in the New Testament, among other places. We nowhere find it stated in the New Testament that a man was possessed by an animal. This so-called animal possession is encountered elsewhere, for instance in China, where women in particular believe that they are possessed by a monkey or a fox.³ In South Africa we find the view

¹ THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa Theologiae*, II, 2, qu. CLXXII, art. V.

² CALVIN, *Inst.*, I, XIV, 19: "... non motiones aut affectiones mentium, sed magis revera, quod dicuntur, mentes vel spiritus sensu et intelligentia praeditos."

³ OESTERREICH, *Die Besessenheit*, p. 217... Cf. BAUMANN, *Psyche's lijden*, pp. 91-102. In various medical authors in Antiquity we find a chapter: *Peri Lykanthropia*, on wolf-men. In it a certain kind of melancholia is described, viz. the delusion that one has been changed into a wolf. In therianthropism the spirit becomes animal and the disturbed person assumes the form of an animal. This is regarded as the doing of evil spirits of the dead, "for the souls of the dead live on in corpse-eating spirits" (p. 94). "Lycanthropy is the best known of the delirium metamorphoses. It was and still is among many peoples a very common disease of the mind" (p. 98)... On the strength of Dan. 4:33 a: "psychose

that various people can transform themselves temporarily into lions, hyenas, etc.¹ In the New Testament we find one example of possessed animals, viz. that of the Gadarene swine. The belief that animals can be possessed is a common one.² Now the question is the following: in what way do the demons take possession of their victims? The New Testament is vague on this point: the demon "takes" someone;³ he "enters"⁴ or "buffets."⁵ It may be derived from the name "spirit" and from the organs affected and apotropaia used that the demon often stealthily enters through one or the other bodily orifice (eye, mouth, ear). The unclean spirit enters as *pneuma*, as breath. The Jew Eleazar once expelled a devil through the nostrils of a demoniac.⁶ The evil eye attacks the victim through the eye;⁷

analog der Lykanthropie der Alten" was also ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar; see PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 356.

¹ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 143. BAUMANN, *Psyche's lijden*, p. 94. See also VAN BAAREN, *Wij mensen*, p. 109 . . . In the Middle Ages there was a firm belief in werewolves or wolf-men. People also believed that they had been changed into a horse, a cock or a goat, and imitated these animals.

² See OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 120, on the healing of a possessed camel by Hilarion.

³ Mk. 9 : 18, καταλαμβάνω; apprehendo.

⁴ Mt. 12 : 45; Mk. 5 : 13; 9 : 25; Lk. 8 : 32, 33; cf. Lk. 22 : 3; Jn. 13 : 27, εἰσέρχομαι; intro. NOACK, *Satanas u. Soteria*, p. 91: "Unseren Stellen am nächsten verwandt ist der Ausdruck in Mart. Is. 2, 1: Sammael nistete sich in Manasse ein und umklammerte ihn, womit 3, 11 zu vergleichen ist: Belial besass das Herz Manasses." Cf. p. 31 f. Cf. SCHLIER, *Mächte u. Gewalten im NT*, p. 21. Schlier sees the demon in the N.T. as a "personales Wesen," as an "intentionales, rationales und voluntatives Gegenüber." But these demons are also "Exemplare einer Gattung" (p. 17). Cf. p. 63: "Die vielfältigen Mächte, die doch immer nur die eine satanische Macht entfalten, begegnen jeweils als eine Art personalen Wesens von Macht."

⁵ 2 Co. 12 : 7, κολαφίζω; colaphiso.

⁶ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Ant.*, VIII, II, 5.

⁷ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 833. The evil eye, ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς πονηρός, עֵין רָעָה (Pro. 23 : 6; 28 : 22). Alongside with this there also appears a "bountiful eye," עֵין טוֹבָה (Pro. 22 : 9). BLAU, *Das altjüdische Zaubrerwesen*, p. 152: "Die Vorstellung, der Blick mancher Personen, Familien oder Stämme bewirke Schaden an Leben und Gut, war bei den klassischen Völkern stark verbreitet." The Hungarian says: strike with the eye, bewitch. Joseph's progeny were immune from the evil eye (*op. cit.*, p. 155). An obscene or ridiculous gesture was often made to ward off the evil eye, and still is in Southern Italy today. TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, pp. 54-56. "Not a few unfortunate men are born jettatori, shedding rays of destruction about them with every glance, frequently themselves unaware of their dread influence" (p. 54). Cf. PEDERSEN, *Israel, its Life and Culture*, I-II, p. 176, the manifestation of the soul in the eye. If a man looks at something, at that moment the eye is the particularly active part of the body. "Therefore the soul is at that moment eye." Through the evil eye the spirit

the demon can also seize the intellect of the man he possesses. The demon achieves entry to his prey in other ways, too, viz. by biting (snake) or stinging (scorpion); he settles on the hands at night,¹ etc. The demon also uses dreams.²

Again and again all kinds of demons bring disaster down upon men, and gradually certain demons are linked by name to certain diseases. Various scholars believe that in the Old Testament there are already some texts which are unambiguous references to these disease-producing demons. In Job 18 : 13 leprosy is called "the firstborn of death." Is this poetic personification or does it point to an evil spirit of leprosy?³ According to DUHM Ps. 91 : 5, 6 is proof that the plague was depicted as a demon,⁴ an interpretation shared by JIRKU, provided that Duhm's interpretation is correct.⁵ The plague was therefore seen as an evil spirit abroad in the night, whilst the arrow that flieth by day, the scorching sunray, was the meridianus demon that causes sunstroke.⁶ KAUPPEL, however, sees in Ps. 91 : 5, 6 merely a poetic turn of phrase, and thus not an indication of evil spirits.⁷ It is dubious whether 2 Ki. 4 : 18 ff. gives

therefore concentrates on the victim. Numerous examples and illustrations are given by F. T. ELWORTHY, *The Evil Eye*.

¹ EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*, p. 182, praises the pure way of life recommended in the Talmud, e.g. the frequent washing of the hands. The demon is even said to appreciate one's washing one's hands three times. Cf. the detailed exposé on "Gesundheitspflege," PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 588 ff. . . . Backgrounds and motives may disappear and change, but hygiene is also an important factor in the new state of Israel. See SUNIER, *Mental Illness and Psychiatric Care in Israel*. The death rate and birth rate are displaying a favourable aspect. "This pattern is due to the relatively high levels of health services as well as of personal hygiene in an important part of the population and to the high natality of the Oriental immigrants" (p. 9).

² TERTULLIAN, *De Anima*, XLVII: "For we find that dreams are mostly inspired by demons . . ." (*Definimus enim a daemoniis plurimum incuti somnia . . .*) The Stoa also believes that dreams can come from gods or from demons, see WASZINK, *Tertullian de Anima*, p. 271. Cf. ROHDE, *Psyche*, II, p. 80 ff., on Hecate, her henchmen and demoniac dogs. "Diese nächtlich umherschweifenden Seelengeister bringen allen, denen sie begegnen oder die sie überfallen, 'Befleckung' und Unheil, angstvolle Träume, Alpdrücken, nächtliche Schreckgesichte, Wahn-sinn und Epilepsie" (p. 84).

³ DUHM, *op. cit.*, p. 27. G. HÖLSCHER, *Das Buch Hiob*, thinks here of a mythological figure representing the plague.

⁴ DUHM, *op. cit.*, pp. 27, 52.

⁵ JIRKU, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

⁶ Cf. R. KITTEL, *Die Psalmen*, with reference to Ps. 91 : 5, 6; and H. SCHMIDT, *Die Psalmen*. LANGTON, *op. cit.*, pp. 48 ff.; דָּבָר plague, and קָטָב, destruction, represent demons.

⁷ KAUPPEL, *op. cit.*, p. 33 ff.

cause for the view that here a headache demon is at work.¹ JIRKU remarks with regard to Hosea 13 : 14: "Death and the underworld are here depicted as being in the possession of diseases which they can loose on mankind,"² whilst KAUPEL characterizes this verse merely as "purely poetic."³

It will be quite evident from the above examples that there is anything but unanimity about the interpretation of the Old Testament texts relating to demons. After the Exile demonology becomes more clearly delineated; apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature is full of examples of this. Enoch describes the creation of demons⁴ and relates how Kasdeya, the fallen angel, informed the children of men of all kinds of evil plans harboured by the demons.⁵ The Book of Jubilees tells that unclean spirits seduced the children of Noah's sons.⁶ It is said of Solomon that he knew the "system of the world" and the power of the elements, and also "the might of spirits and the thoughts of men."⁷ The demons set themselves the aim of tempting man in every possible way to practice witchcraft, to worship false gods, to shed blood, etc.⁸ They are led by Mastema,

¹ JIRKU, op. cit., p. 45, here envisages Babylonian conjuration rites, in which the headache is ascribed to a demon.

² JIRKU, op. cit., p. 45.

³ KAUPEL, op. cit., p. 33.

⁴ (Aeth.), ENOCH, cap. 15.

⁵ ENOCH 69 : 12: "Der fünfte heisst Kasdeja; dieser hat die Menschenkinder allerlei böse Schläge der Geister und Dämonen gelehrt, die Schläge des Embryo im Mutterleib, damit er abgehe, die Schläge der Seele (?), den Schlangenbiss, die Schläge, die durch die Mittagshitze entstehen, den Sohn der Schlange, der Tabat (?) heisst" (transl. G. Beer). Azazel and Semyaza also brought all kinds of injustice to earth, Enoch 9 : 6 ff. . . . Jub. 15 : 33 mentions Beliar, whose name is often encountered in the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs. LANGTON, op. cit., p. 128: "The main conclusion to be drawn is that Beliar is one of the apocalyptic names for the chief power of evil. It is sometimes used in the Testaments interchangeably with Satan and the devil." See also BRAUN, TWNT, VI, p. 239 f., on the important part which the spirits of error and deceit, τὰ πνεύματα τῆς πλάνης, play in the Testaments of the twelve Patriarchs. BEEK, op. cit., p. 100 f.

⁶ Jub. 10 : 1. Mastema, the prince of evil spirits, requests God to leave him some sons of man, "for great is the evil of the sons of man" (10 : 8). LANGTON, op. cit., p. 124 f. The name Mastema is probably derived from the Hebrew verb מַשָּׂה, i.e. to be an opponent or enemy. "Thus the word is equivalent to 'Satan' (adversary)." Cf. NOACK, Satan u. Soteria, p. 39 ff.

⁷ SAPIENTIA SALOMONIS, 7 : 17 ff. Solomon says that he knows everything, the concealed and the known, because the artist, Wisdom, has taught him (7 : 21, ἡ γὰρ πάντων τεχνίτης ἐδίδαξέ με σοφία).

⁸ Cf. the Proverbs of Sextus, 304, 305. "Gott bestärkt die Menschen zu guten Taten. Zu bösen Taten ist ein böser Dämon Führer" (transl. J. Kroll). NOACK,

"the prince of spirits",¹ and serve Satan "on earth."² In the post-Christian era, in the period of the Tannaim, the belief in demons also continued to grow steadily.

Rabbi Joḥanan (d. 279) tells that he knew of 300 kinds of demons.³ All kinds of names are encountered: Lilith, Igrat, bath Maḥlath, etc.; the demons are often called mazzikīn, i.e. "damagers."⁴ The number of evil spirits is fabulously high: "it is even said that everyone has 1000 to his left and 100,000 to his right — they are held responsible for the rabbis feeling weak at the knees and for their clothing wearing out."⁵ As "unclean" spirits they form a constant contrast to the "holy Spirit" of God.

According to STRACK-BILLERBECK, to the rabbis the idea that diseases were caused by demons was such an ordinary one that they often called the diseases after the name of the evil spirit causing them. They spoke of an "asthma spirit," a "madness spirit," a "catarrh spirit," etc. Hammath is the "fever spirit;" Bath—Ḥorin caused blindness and polyps.⁶ Leprosy was ascribed to a "spirit of leprosy;" a man might be plagued by a "spirit of heart disease," by a "spirit of eye disease," etc. According to BLAU, this would indicate that many rabbis, "like the Chaldees, the Egyptians and the Christians, ascribed all diseases to possession."⁷

Satanas u. Soteria, p. 19, is of the opinion that: "das Zerstören und Töten die Hauptfunktion der Dämonen ist, das Verführen dagegen die abgeleitete." The work of Satan is most clearly defined in Baba Bathra 16a: Satan is the tempter, the accuser and the angel of death (p. 20).

¹ Jub. 10 : 8.

² Jub. 10 : 11. Satan was permitted to dispose of one tenth of the evil men on earth for his purposes; nine tenths were bound in the place of damnation.

³ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1, p. 509. Cf. BLAU, op. cit., p. 11.

⁴ BLAU, op. cit., p. 14.

⁵ BLAU, op. cit., p. 11. See also NOACK, Satanas u. Soteria, p. 15 ff. The activities of the demons, viz. tormenting and destroying, find expression in their names; besides the מַזְקִין we also find מַחְבִּלִין, corrupters, and פּוֹנְעִין, assailants.

⁶ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1, p. 524 ff. Cf. SCHÜRER, Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes, III, p. 295; BLAU, op. cit., p. 55.

⁷ BLAU, op. cit., p. 14. Blau gives both here and elsewhere references in the Talmud . . . MAES, Fetischen of tooverbeelden uit Kongo, gives many examples of spirits who each afflict man with certain diseases. For instance the spirit of Semba causes diseases of the lung (p. 11), that of Mawenze diseases of the ear (p. 11), whilst Mambo's spirit brings epilepsy (p. 17), etc. See also HEILER, Das Gebet, p. 112: Indian tribes speak of a spirit of smallpox, a plague demon, etc. SIGERIST, A History of Medicine, states with approval the opinion of F. E. Clements (Primitive Concepts of Disease, Univ. of Calif. Public. in American Arch. and Ethnol., 1932, 32 [2], pp. 185-252) that a sharp distinction must be made "between spirit intrusion and possession." "A stomach ache may be

CANAAN tells us that it was still so in the Palestine of thirty years ago. The demon *hanuk* causes diphtheria, so that this disease bears the same name. The same applies to *ta'un*, plague, and *riḥ-asfar*, cholera. It is remarkable that in these names the methods of the demons find expression. *hanuk* is connected with a verb meaning to strangle and *ta'un* contains the idea of stinging.¹

As a result of this increasing belief in demons as forces bringing disaster a dangerous abatement in belief in Yahweh occurred in later Judaism. Men might have faith in God and His angels, and they might believe that studying the Talmud gave strength to repel the demons, but all the same they took all kinds of precautions for safety's sake.² In the long run many rabbis yielded to the superstition and the magical practices of the people and began to devote particular attention to this subject. It is even said of Rabbi Joḥanan ben Zakkai that he understood the language of demons.³ The story goes that Simeon ben Joḥai (150 A.D.) expelled a demon from the Emperor's daughter, and that by a look he transformed someone into a heap of bones.⁴ Rabbi Simeon ben Joḥai (ca. 150), R. Aḥa bar Jacob (d. 325), R. Papa (d. 376) and Mar bar R. Ashi (ca. 450) all had power over demons in differing degrees.⁵ The conjuration spells were often supplied by Talmud teachers who were also physicians.

The enormous effect which this belief in the malign power and

caused by a spirit who does not make himself known. If he is found out, it is through the medicine man's diagnosis. In the case of possession, the spirit is vocal; he speaks through the victim. Mental and nervous diseases are explained in such a way, delirium, hysteria, epilepsy and others" (p. 136). The theory of "spirit intrusion" is widespread, but is probably unknown in Australia, Tasmania and a number of other regions. PREUSS, *op. cit.*, wishes to point out that the description of demonism in the Talmud differs from that in the Gospels. "Während die Evangelien unter den Dämonischen Tobsüchtige verstehen, nennen die Talmudisten in der Regel nur körperliche Erkrankungen, die durch den ruach oder sched bedingt sind, und nur sehr selten wird der Irrsinn geradezu mit dem Sched identifiziert" (p. 367). In the Mishna madmen are referred to solely by the name "schōteh", derived from "schat", meaning to wander as a vagabond. Such a mentally ill person is considered capable of doing certain forms of work; Preuss states that it may be concluded from this: "dass man in ihm nicht den Wahnsinnigen nach dem obigen Bilde der Evangelien oder nach der Vorstellung des Volkes sah, die ihn fast dem Tier gleichsetzen" (p. 362).

¹ CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 28.

² FOERSTER, TWNT, II, p. 14. However, the demons do not form intermediaries between God and man, as with the Greeks. They remain spirits.

³ FOERSTER, TWNT, II, p. 14.

⁴ BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

⁵ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1, p. 534.

effect of demons gradually acquired is most evident in the Middle Ages, when through the channels of the Roman Empire and the Christianization of Europe a fusion occurred with the peoples' own worlds of ideas. The human spirit was as it were paralysed. The demons filled the air, which was concluded from Isa. 13; Eph. 2 : 2, 6 : 12 and other Biblical texts. They displayed their power in thunder, storm and rain, in brief in all kinds of disasters and calamities. The doctrines on demons of Hieronymus, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas and others left deep marks in the minds of churchpeople. Bernard of Clairvaux once dispersed a swarm of gnats by a curse as he was entering the pulpit. Ambrose tells how a priest silenced the croaking of frogs which troubled him during Mass by exorcising them. Coughing, catarrh, wrinkles, disturbed sleep — the strangest things were attributed to demons. Luther perceived diabolic influences in the flies that flew over his books and in the rats that disturbed his sleep. He believed that demons who were imprisoned in a lake in his home town caused a violent thunderstorm when a stone was thrown in the water.¹ No wonder, then, that the means of protection against the malignancy of demons were legion, and the many protective methods of antiquity were supplemented by all kinds of means which had been given the sanction of the Church.

3. *Defence against and expulsion of demons*

Anyone desirous of studying the inexhaustible fertility of invention of man caught in a web of fear will be surprisingly successful if he takes the trouble to explore the strange region of the methods and means of protection against evil spirits. Although we shall confine ourselves here to the means that we encounter in Israel, in Judaism and among the early Christians, we shall nevertheless come into contact with a rich variety. JIRKU examined and classified the countermeasures of the Israelites. He is of the opinion that the true

¹ OESTERREICH, op. cit., p. 181, says that Luther brought about no changes in the demonological way of thought of the Middle Ages. "Er hielt alle Geisteskrankheit für Besessenheit, ebenso der Selbstmord für eine Folgeerscheinung derselben." Cf. STEPLINGER, *Antiker Aberglaube*, pp. 13, 20 ff. WHITE, *Histoire de la Lutte* etc., pp. 235, 361. J. M. ROBERTSON, *Geschichte des Christentums*, says that the Protestant countries burnt at least as many women on account of so-called witchcraft as the Inquisition did on account of heresy: "Luther, der doch sonst die Kinderwelt so liebte, war imstande, den Rat zu geben, man solle ein 'besessenes' Kind in den Fluss werfen, um es zu ertränken oder zu heilen" (p. 373).

nature and significance of all kinds of rules and regulations was nothing more than the repulsion of evil spirits,¹ indeed that sacrifices among the Hebrews had originally this sole intention.² Later this was not realized and the rules and regulations were interpreted differently, viz. for the glory of the God of Israel.³ We cannot go further here into this view of Jirku's, about which a good deal could certainly be said — KAUPPEL controverts Jirku and also Duhm on many a point — but we should like to mention the apotropaia against demons which according to JIRKU are indicated in the Old Testament. An important agent is blood.⁴ It was believed that by the use of blood the demon would as it were be saturated.⁵ Water, particularly so-called "living water" such as that of the Jordan, also plays a major role.⁶ Animals or parts of animals were used as substitutes for diseased organs.⁷ Plants, hyssop and cedar are excellent apotropaia.⁸ The demons can be as it were shut up in statutes or pictures. According to JIRKU, 1 Sa. 6 : 4 ff., for instance, must not be seen as a tribute to the demons; instead they were detained here.⁹

¹ JIRKU, op. cit., p. 92 ff.

² JIRKU, op. cit., p. 82.

³ JIRKU, op. cit., p. 95.

⁴ The apotropaic force of blood is portrayed in Ex. 12 : 22; 4 : 24-26. According to JIRKU the "bloody husband" is the night demon (op. cit., p. 59; cf. G. BEER-K. GALLING, Exodus). Cf. also the function of blood in the cleansing of lepers, Lev. 14, and the power of the blood of the defeated and of menstrual blood. H. STRACK, Das Blut im Glauben u. Aberglauben der Menschheit.

⁵ JIRKU, op. cit., p. 91.

⁶ JIRKU, op. cit., p. 64 ff. See 2 Ki. 5; Lev. 14; Nu. 19 : 13; Gen. 26 : 19 "a well of springing water;" Jer. 2 : 13, God as "the fountain of living waters;" Zech. 13 : 1; 14 : 8; Nu. 19 : 21 on "water of separation" that is both curative and dangerous. "Diese Anschauung von der dämonenabwehrenden Kraft des Wassers ist gemeinsemitisch" (p. 64).

⁷ JIRKU, op. cit., p. 72. The Babylonians dedicated a sacrificial animal to the demon of disease as a substitute; parts of animals were also sacrificed, cf. Lev. 1 : 9 ff.; 3 : 15 ff.; 4 : 8-12.

⁸ JIRKU, op. cit., p. 77. Cf. Gen. 30 : 14 ff., the mandrakes. See BÖHL, Genesis, II. Hyssop had defensive power, cf. Ex. 12 : 22; Lev. 14 : 48 ff., Ps. 51 : 7. The cedar was the tree of Jahweh, Ps. 104 : 16, cf. Ps. 92 : 12 ff. Hyssop and cedar have special power: "Die Zeder, weil sie am Libanon wuchs, und der Ysop, weil er aus der Mauer hervorsprosst," JIRKU, op. cit., p. 79. FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS describes the demon-expelling power of a plant growing near Baras, De bello Jud., VII, VI, 3.

⁹ JIRKU, op. cit., p. 79 ff. Cf. Nu. 21 : 6 ff. "Auch hier wird der Tierdämon dadurch unschädlich gemacht, dass man ein Bildwerk desjenigen Tieres, in dessen Gestalt er sein Unwesen treibt, anfertigt." Cf. 2 Ki. 18 : 4. According to Jirku the pillars of brass, Jachin and Boaz, 1 Ki. 7 : 15 ff., served to ward off demons. Cf. also the signs on the doorposts, Deu. 6 : 9 and Isa. 57 : 8. "Die Tür galt als der Ort, durch den die Dämonen mit Vorliebe eindringen" (p. 84).

Bells repel demons.¹ Certain colours, especially blue and red, keep evil spirits at a distance.² A remarkable method much applied is binding magic (*Knotenzauber*), i.e. the demons can be tied up. This binding magic originates from practical experience; just as man can be bound and released, so can demons. Cords and ropes were also torn asunder to symbolize the liberation of victims from the power of the demons.³

A leading part in apotropaia is played by the amulet which, in the form of a natural object or as an artificial process, with or without words on them, had to protect men or bring them healing. Originally all ornaments were probably meant as amulets. In Isa. 3 : 20 the list of women's jewellery mentions "tablets." GALLING points out that the religion of Israel never combated the amulet, since otherwise this must have become evident, particularly from the Deuteronomic Code.⁴ It is remarkable that there is not a single statement by Jesus

¹ Ex. 28 : 33 ff. The demons who live under thresholds are dangerous; cf. Isa. 3 : 18, the "ornaments about their feet;" 1 Sa. 5 : 5; Zeph. 1 : 9. KAUPEL, op. cit., p. 75 ff., contests the view of JIRKU, Duhm and others that the O.T. contains references to belief in threshold demons. And according to Kaupel Ex. 28 : 35 excludes the defensive character of the bells. He says that here we must think solely of music and revelry, cf. 2 Sa. 6 : 5 and Nu. 10 : 10 (p. 80). For the defensive power of the sound of church bells in the Middle Ages see STEMPLINGER, op. cit., p. 86. WHITE, op. cit., p. 239, writes of the consecration of bells with water from the Jordan. A carillon in the Jesuit Church of Pont-à-Mousson, dating back to 1634, bears the inscription: "they praise God, scatter the clouds, terrify demons and invite the people." The Reformers rejected the baptism of bells, but the belief lived on.

² Ex. 28 : 6; 39 : 2; 26 : 4. According to JIRKU, op. cit., p. 86 f., blue and scarlet here are probably apotropaic means. Cf. Jos. 2 : 18, 21, Rahab's line. Through this line disaster was averted from her. Red and blue are perhaps a secondary derivation from blood, according to JIRKU. See further CANAAN, *Aberglaube*, p. 47 ff., on blue amulets, blue pearls, blue paintings, etc., and L. BAUER, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*, p. 198 f.

³ According to JIRKU, op. cit., p. 88, we definitely encounter binding magic in Ez. 13 : 17 ff. And perhaps in Gen. 38 : 28 too? It was well known in Babylon. KAUPEL, op. cit., p. 19: "Dass dieser 'Knotenzauber' ein Produkt besagten ausländischen Einflusses war, wird von Jirku nicht genügend gewürdigt." Cf. A. BERTHOLET-K. GALLING, Hesekiel, in Ez. 13 : 17 ff. we encounter magical practices performed with concrete objects. EERDMANS, *The Religion of Israel*, points to Daniel's power of "unravelling" knots, Dan. 5 : 12: "A cord was bound round the head of a sick man, fastened by a difficult knot. Then the sorcerer spoke his formulae, saying at the end: May thou that causes this pain be untied and loosened as I untie this knot" (p. 300).

⁴ GALLING, *Bibl. Reallexikon*, col. 29 f.: "Wie Num. 15 : 38 ff. und Deut. 22 : 12 zeigen, hat man das A. unbeanstandet gelassen." Texts like Mt. 14 : 36; 23 : 5 and Ac. 19 : 12 point to the belief in the apotropaic and healing force of

on record against belief in the power of amulets. There were doubtless books of magic and written spells in circulation among the Jews.¹ As was the case with all other peoples, everyone wore amulets, the physician just as much as the labourer. In Jewish literature the amulet is called *kame'a*, i.e. something tied round or on. According to tradition, Abraham wore a jewel round his neck, and all who gazed upon it were healed forthwith.² Anything might be written on amulets: the name of God, the name of a demon, words from the Torah, the name of the person to be protected, etc. Ex. 15 : 26, "for I am the Lord that healeth thee," was used for healing, and Ps. 91 : 5 as a formula against evil spirits.³ In the first centuries of Christianity the demons were countered with the "name of Jesus," whilst later the sign of the cross became a particularly strong weapon.

All kinds of sacred objects, consecrated hosts, altar cloths, relics, etc., were used in the struggle against the legions of demons. In this way men, who believed themselves threatened, tried to protect themselves against the forces which caused them to live in perpetual fear.⁴

However, the struggle became more difficult when a demon had once conquered his prey. Although the methods used for the expulsion of demons vary from simple forms to the most complicated ritual, the basic idea remains the same, viz. the conqueror must him-

"charged" items of clothing. Cf. Ez. 44 : 17-19 for the charged quality of the priests' garments.

¹ SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, III, p. 299.

² BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 86 ff., 160. See also TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, pp. 132-152, Amulets.

³ BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 93 ff. In the magical papyri too we often encounter the name of God, *Ja* or *Jao* or "*the name*." Cf. p. 123 ff. on the tetragram. NILSSON, *Die Religion in den griech. Zauberpapyri*. L. BAUER, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*, p. 198, on amulets with proverbs from the Koran. EERDMANS, *op. cit.*, points to Ps. 22, which was recited if one suffered from a fever at night (p. 301) . . . Eerdmans says the following about Blau's investigation: "Dr. L. Blau, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*, Strassburg, Trübner, 1898, gave many instances dating from the Rabbinical period, which are a good illustration of the practices as they were current in the time of Jesus and before" (p. 301).

⁴ See STEPLINGER, *Antiker Aberglaube*. ELWORTHY, *The Evil Eye*, p. 115 ff., Ch. IV, Symbols and Amulets . . . VON HARNACK, *Mission u. Ausbreitung*, I, p. 141, points to the great propagandistic value of exorcism by the Christians. "Als Dämonenbeschwörer sind die Christen in die grosse Welt eingetreten, und die Beschwörung war ein sehr wichtiges Mittel der Mission und Propaganda. Es handelte sich dabei um die Beschwörung und Besiegung der in den einzelnen Menschen wohnenden Dämonen, aber auch um die Reinigung des Luftraumes und des ganzen öffentlichen Lebens von ihnen."

self be conquered, the fear-maker must himself be frightened into releasing his victim.¹ The Book of Tobit relates that Tobit once expelled a demon from a woman by frying the heart and liver of a fish caught in the Tigris: the evil spirit, who had already killed seven husbands of the woman on their wedding night, fled from the smell of the fish.² The idea of force against force is clearly characterized in the Acts of Thomas. A beautiful woman possessed by an evil spirit begged the apostle to liberate her. Thomas addressed the demon in threatening words such as "wickedness," "effrontery," etc., whereupon the demon answered in a loud voice: what have we to do with you, apostle of the Most High? The demon addressed all kinds of reproaches to Thomas and said: "Why do you wish to use force against us, you above all who teach others to use no force?" After having pointed out that the Son of God had confused the demons by His unpretentious appearance and His poverty, the demon left the woman in fire and smoke.³

The idea that the demoniac was an entirely or partly "bound" person, i.e. handicapped in certain functions (deafness, paralysis, etc.) was widespread.⁴

Now if a demon can bind men, why should not men in their turn be able to bind or release a demon? The binding of the dead among primitive peoples is an indication of the fear that the dead will return. CLEMEN points to the body of Lazarus bound hand and foot, and states that in Lincolnshire, England, the feet of the dead are still bound.⁵ We have made a passing reference above

¹ An interesting example of the exorcism of spirits is given by RIVERS, *Medicine, Magic and Religion*, p. 16 f. A "leech" moves a hot packet, smeared with clay, along the body of the sick person while pronouncing conjurations and making snake-like motions. Meanwhile the patient stamps on the ground to shake off the evil spirit. The serpentine demon is exorcised in all kinds of terms; he must disappear into the depths of the sea. This is how it is done on the Duke of York Island in New Britain. In essence there is no difference between this method and that of the Jews, cf. BLAU, *op. cit.*, p. 75, whilst also the method of conjuration applied in the *Manuale Exorcismorum* of the Roman Catholic Church amounts to the same thing. In this the victorious power of Christ is contrasted with the evil spirit, who is reviled as an "enemy of the faith, enemy of the human race, bringer of death, depriver of life, violator of law, root of all evil, seducer of men, betrayer of the people," etc. He is commanded: "and therefore give way in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; make way for the Holy Ghost by this sign of the cross of Jesus Christ our Lord." For the Latin text see OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 98 ff. Cf. EITREM, *Demonology*, p. 19.

² Tobit, cap. 6-8.

³ Acta Thom., 42 ff.

⁴ DEISSMANN, *Licht v. Osten*, p. 258.

⁵ CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, pp. 12, 132.

to the frequent use of "binding" and "releasing" in the service of both good and evil; the greatest care had to be observed, particularly in critical times (birth, marriage).¹

The early Christians drove out the demons by prayers and precepts from Holy Writ, and in particular by the "name of Jesus." The places which the demons inhabited were purified, whilst animals were also freed from demons.² EUSEBIUS gives an account of a sacrificial animal that was thrown in the source of the Jordan, near Paneas, on a feast day. Through the power of a demon it disappeared. However, in answer to the prayers of a certain Astyrius the victim suddenly reappeared at the surface.³

When old Christian literature speaks of the fear of demons and the expulsion of demons, it must also be borne in mind that the gods of the pagans were called demons as well, that various heathen conceptions are incorporated in the demonology of the early Christian writers, and that the reality of the pagan gods was not denied. MINUCIUS FELIX, for instance, speaks in the same breath of the unclean spirits which conceal themselves under statues and consecrated images, linger in temples, control the flight of birds and call man away from God to material things. They throw life into disorder and "by secretly entering the body in the form of ethereal spirits they breed disease; they frighten the mind, distort limbs, so that they may compel their victims to pay homage to them, so that they, fattened by the scent of altars or by the sacrifices of cattle, after releasing their prey, may seem to have brought healing."⁴ Saturn,

¹ Cf. ROHDE, *Psyche*, II, p. 88, on the "spells" by which the magician masters the spirits; sayings used, ceremonies, etc. HEMPEL, *RGG*, III, col. 1107 f., art. Knoten; TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, p. 127. ELIADE, *Images et Symboles*, pp. 120-163, Ch. III. Le "Dieu Lieur" et le symbolisme des noeuds. There is always an ambivalence: "—les nœuds provoquent la maladie et aussi ils l'écartent ou guérissent le malade; les filets et les nœuds ensorcellent et aussi protègent contre l'ensorcellement—" (p. 147).

² ORIGEN, c. *Celsum*, VII, 67.

³ EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, VII, XVII.

⁴ MINUCIUS FELIX, *Octavius*, XXVII: ". . . irrepentes etiam corporibus occulte, ut spiritus tenebre: morbos fingunt, terrent mentes, membra distorquent, ut ad cultum sui cogant, ut nidore altarium vel hostiis pecudum saginati; remissis, quae constrinxerant, curasse videantur." Cf. ORIGEN, c. *Celsum*, VII, 67; VIII, 3 (all pagan gods are demons); VIII, 24 (one cannot sit at the table of the demons and at the table of the Lord; cf. also VIII, 30, 32); VIII, 33 ("we are not subject to demons, but to the Lord over all, through Jesus the Christ, who brings us [to Him]," cf. VIII, 61); CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Protr.*, IV, 51-53, on the worthlessness of images of gods and pagan temples. Cf. the chapter: *Miracles and Science*.

Serapis and Jupiter: "when overcome by pain, say what they are." "Believe that they are demons, for they bear witness to it themselves, whilst they confess the truth concerning themselves. But if exorcised by the true, the only God, their bodies quake in wretched fashion, despite themselves, and either they withdraw forthwith, or they disappear gradually, according as the faith of the sufferer assists, or the grace of God inspires the healer."¹ When CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA warns the Christians against the fear of demons, he has the pagan gods particularly in mind. "The heights of ignorance are therefore godlessness and the fear of demons, which one must endeavour to avoid."² Elsewhere he calls demons "pernicious and mischievous, ensnarers, haters of men and corrupters." He says that man is better than the gods of Greece, and Cyrus and Solon better than the soothsayer Apollo.³ He makes a characteristic statement on the fear of demons: "Of course the fear of demons, once it had taken a hold somewhere, became the source of senseless wickedness. And thereafter, not having been pruned, but having flourished, and growing to all sides, it becomes the creator of many a demon sacrificing hecatombs and organizing meetings of the people and erecting statues and building temples, which latter however — for I shall not withhold this either, but rather unmask them — although euphemistically called temples, are yet graves, that is to say graves which are called temples. You must then rid your memories of the fear of demons, though it be only now that you do so, and shame that you worshipped graves."⁴

¹ MIN. FELIX, *op. cit.*, XXVII: "Ipse Saturnus, et Serapis, et Jupiter, et quidquid daemonum colitis, victi dolore, quod sunt, eloquuntur; nec utique in turpitudinem sui, nonnullis praesertim vestrum assistentibus, mentiuntur. Ipsis testibus esse eos daemones de se verum confitentibus credite. Adjurati enim per Deum verum et solum, inviti, miseri, corporibus inhorrescunt; vel exiliunt statim, vel evanescent gradatim, prout fides patientis adjuvat, aut gratia curantis aspirat."

² CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Protr.*, II, 25. Cf. *Strom.* II, VIII, 40. JUSTIN, *Apologia*, 58: the so-called evil spirits aim at nothing less than to turn men away from God and Christ, His only-begotten Son.

³ CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Protr.*, III, 43.

⁴ *Id.* III, 44; cf. IV, 62. See among others WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. 137 ff., on: *Heilende Statuen und Bilder . . .* KOETS, *Deisidaimonia*, p. 87, says of the fierce attitude of Clement of Alexandria: "Clemens of Alexandria passionately hated the 'inhuman and misanthropic demons,' and his language shows a certain fierceness when he attacks the stupidity of those who fear them." See Ch. III, *Deisidaimonia* etc. as used by the Christian Authors, pp. 84-96. Koets examines the development of the meaning of the concept "deisidaimonia." The original meaning, viz. "awe of higher forces", was abandoned by the early Christian authors. *Deisidaimonia* was given by them the meaning of fear of demons, pagandom.

In the same spirit as Minucius Felix and Clement of Alexandria CYPRIAN, referring to the view of poets, writes that angels and demons are intermediate beings. "These spirits thus conceal themselves under statues and consecrated images. . . They are themselves deceived and deceive; they disturb life and make man fearful in his sleep. They creep into the body and secretly fill the mind with fear; they distort limbs, break man's health and cause disease, so that sacrifices will be made to them. . . They have no other desire than to lead man astray from God and to turn him away from the true religion to a superstitious fear of them. As they themselves are deserving of punishment, they seek companions in that punishment by making them share in their criminal error. But when they are exorcised by us in the name of the true God, they give way at once, confess [their deeds] and are compelled to leave the bodies they possess."¹ LACTANTIUS makes a distinction between two races of demons, earthly and heavenly. The earthly ones are the unclean spirits, originators of evil, whose prince is the devil. He also describes the demons as "ethereal and elusive spirits that penetrate the bodies of men and, hidden in their bowels, do their work, damaging health, causing disease, terrifying the soul by dreams and agitating the mind by frenzies." Perhaps, Lactantius remarks, someone will say that they have to be venerated so that they do no harm! The unbeliever suffers injury and harm, it is true, but the believer does not.²

¹ CYPRIAN, *De Idolorum Vanitate Liber* (Quod idola non sint). "Hi ergo spiritus sub statu is atque imaginibus consecratis delitescunt . . . Nam et falluntur et fallunt: vitam turbant, somnos inquietant. Irrepentes etiam in corporibus occulte mentes terrent, membra distorquent, valetudinem frangunt, morbos lacessunt: ut ad cultum sui cogant; ut nidore altarium, et rogis pecorum saginati, remissis quae constrinxerant, curasse videantur . . . Nec aliud illis studium est, quam a Deo homines avocare, et ad superstitionem sui ab intellectu verae religionis avertere; cum sunt ipsi poenales, quaerere sibi ad poenam comites, quos ad crimen suum fecerint errore participes. Hi tamen adjurati per Deum verum a nobis, statim cedunt, et fatentur, et de obsessis corporibus exire coguntur."

² LACTANTIUS, *Div. Instit.*, II, 15: "Ita duo genera daemonum facta sunt; unum coeleste, alterum terrenum. Hi sunt immundi spiritus, malorum, quae geruntur, autores, quorum idem diabolus est princeps. Unde Trismegistus illum δαιμονιάρχην vocat . . . Qui quoniam sunt spiritus tenues, et incomprehensibiles, insinuant se corporibus hominum, et occulte in visceribus operati, valetudinem vitiant, morbos citant, somniis animos terrent, mentes furoribus quatunt, ut homines his malis cogant ad eorum auxilia decurrere" . . . Cap. 16: "Dicat fortasse aliquis, colendos esse ergo, ne noceant, siquidem possunt nocere. Nocent illi quidem, sed iis, a quibus timentur, quos manus Dei potens et excelsa non protegit, qui profani sunt a sacramento veritatis. Justos autem, id est cultores

It is understandable that the Christians brought down upon their heads the wrath and hatred of the masses as a result of their disregard, contempt and combating of the pagan gods; a hate that the Christians themselves regarded as sown by the demons in the thoughts of the pagans.¹ On several occasions persecutions were the result of some pagan sacrifice or the other failing because someone had made a sign of the cross on his forehead.²

We thus see that Jew and pagan, each in accordance with his own beliefs and world of ideas, tried in all kinds of ways to repel and bind evil spirits, to banish and exterminate them. It is against this wide background that the healing of the possessed by Jesus must be seen and understood, whilst the activities of the Christians against the world of demons are anchored in faith in the victory and the power of Jesus Christ.

(b) JESUS AND THE DEMONS

The Gospels offer clear proof of the fact that in those days belief in demons was deeply rooted in the Jewish people. According to OTTO, this belief moves in waves through history. "The accounts in the Gospels prove that in the days of Jesus a particularly strong wave of demonism had broken over the world of Palestine."³

Dei, metuunt, cuius nomine adjurati, de corporibus excedunt . . ." Cf. *Epitome Div. Instit.*, XXVIII.

¹ MINUCIUS FELIX, *Octavius*, XXVII, 8; XXVIII, 6: the demons have turned the ears of the inexperienced against the Christians, so that they shrink from them and curse them. "For it is precisely the demons who both sow a false rumour and favour it" (*His enim et huiusmodi fabulis iidem daimones ad execrationis horrorem imperitorum aures adversus nos refererunt . . . Ab ipsis enim rumor falsus et seritur et fovetur*) . . . TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, p. 30, states that "the idea, so frequently encountered in Christian writings, that the demons are the gods of the heathen, is to be found in medieval Jewish works as well. But it played no part in the popular belief."

² LACTANTIUS, *Div. Instit.*, IV, 27. "Nam cum diis suis immolant, si assistat aliquis signatam frontem gerens, sacra nullo modo litant . . . Nec responsa potest consultus reddere vates . . . Et haec saepe causa praecipua iustitiam persequendi, malis regibus fuit."

³ OTTO, *Reich Gottes*, p. 29. KÖHLER, *Theologie des A.T.*, p. 147: "Wir wissen nicht, wieviel Feld die Engel, die Geister und Dämonen im Leben und Glauben des alttestamentlichen Menschen einnehmen. Wir sehen nur, dass für den neutestamentlichen Menschen diese Erscheinungen eine viel grössere Nähe, stärkere Dichte, greifbarere Gestalt haben und dass sie dort deshalb auch theologisch weit bedeutsamer sind." LANGTON, *Essentials of Demonology*, p. 149, believes that "the background of New Testament teaching concerning the existence of a multitude of evil spirits" must be sought not only in apocalyptic literature. Obviously numerous elements must also be sought in Babylonian,

Some are of the opinion that in Galilee in particular belief in demons prevailed.¹ Without doubt it was promoted by various factors. The people lived under heavy political pressure and were longing for release, for the Messiah who would free them from the grasp of the occupying power. TRAUB believes that possession, which he interprets as a manifestation of hysteria and nervous tension, was closely connected with the expectation of the Messiah.² WORCESTER and McCOMB are of the same opinion: demoniac depression is caused by a mass of unfavourable factors such as the poverty of the people, political distress, mental and physical degradation and the Messianic expectation, coupled with all kinds of apocalyptic speculations and belief in evil spirits.³

Although it is possible that in one part of the country belief in demons was stronger than in another, and that the factors mentioned above made their effect felt, the primary point is the spiritual breeding ground, and then it becomes evident that OTTO is right when he speaks of a strong wave of belief in demons in Jesus' day.

Assyria, Persia and Greece: "conceptions which, in turn, go back to primitive animistic ideas. So far as the present phase of the Synoptic teaching is concerned, the main influence is doubtless Babylonian."

¹ See H. LOEWE, in *Encyclop. of Religion and Ethics*, IV, p. 613. Cf. MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 41: perhaps belief in demons was less violent in Judea than in Galilee, but we lack the data on which to base conclusions. NEANDER, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 249: "Wie jene Krankheitsformen mehr in Galiläa als in Jerusalem heimisch waren, erklärt es sich zum Teil daher, dass in dem Johannischen Evangelium nichts von dieser Art der Wunder Christi vorkommt." SMITH, *Ecce Deus*, p. 104. Why were there so many sick persons in Galilee and not in Judea? "Nur eine Antwort ist denkbar: Die Krankheiten in Galiläa waren rein geistlich, Heidentum, falscher Götzendienst, Polytheismus. Die Götzen und Bilder, das waren die Krankheiten, die er heilte, und die Dämonen, die er austrieb." Cf. p. 204 ff. ² TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.*, p. 34.

³ WORCESTER-McCOMB-CORLAT, *Religion and Medicine*, p. 357. Cf. GUIGNEBERT, *Jewish World*, p. 100 ff.; KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 266, says that Palestine and above all Galilee were full of neurasthenics, psychasthenics, hysterical women, epileptics, idiots; in short, the number of mentally defective persons was large . . . In the Old Testament only one case of possession occurs, viz. that of King Saul, 1 Sa. 18 : 10; cf. 16 : 14 and 23. See DUHM, *op. cit.*, p. 15; OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 164: "Aus diesem Bericht geht mit Sicherheit hervor, dass Saul an psychischen Zwangszuständen, die von ihm höchst qualvoll empfunden wurden, litt. Es handelt sich bei ihm also um einen Fall von luzider Besessenheit." FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, VI, VIII, 2, says that Saul was plagued by unrest and evil spirits. According to PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, pp. 356-358, Saul was probably not mentally ill, but only fearful and suffering from chronic depression. Perhaps 1 Sa. 19 : 24 points to epilepsy. "Ob auch echte epileptische Anfälle (grand mal) beobachtet wurden, können wir natürlich nicht wissen, das Schweigen des religionsgeschichtlichen Chronisten beweist nichts."

If we now consider the meetings between Jesus and the possessed, there are essentially two questions that concern us:

- (a) What do the demoniacs say, and what do they know?
- (b) In what way does Jesus approach them?

When we compare the words of the possessed with those of other sick persons or of those who appealed to Jesus in the interests of the sick, it strikes us that there is a difference between the two groups as regards salutation and titles applied to Jesus. In the case of the "ordinary" sick persons such as lepers, paralytics, the blind, etc., we find the following names: "Lord";¹ "Lord, Son of David;"² "Son of David;"³ "Son of David, Jesus;"⁴ "Jesus, Son of David;"⁵ "Master;"⁶ "Jesus, Master;"⁷ "Lord."⁸

Jesus is characterized in another way in the salutations of the demoniacs. The demon addresses Jesus as "Son of God;"⁹ "Jesus of Nazareth;"¹⁰ "Jesus, thou Son of the most high God."¹¹ When they see Jesus the evil spirits cry out: "Thou art the Son of God," whilst the demon creates the impression of possessing special knowledge when he says: "I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God."¹²

The unclean spirits prove to know the "secret" of Jesus, viz. that He, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of the Most High God, is the holy one of God, i.e. He is the Bearer of the Holy Spirit, and between Holy Spirit and unclean spirit "there exists a deadly antithesis that the demons know."¹³ The great question is the following: how do the demons know this secret? If we assume that in possession evil spirits are in fact at work, then this knowing may be regarded as a special knowledge which God has still left them. As supernatural

¹ κύριε, Mt. 8 : 2, 8; 9 : 28; 15 : 25; 15 : 27; 17 : 15; 20 : 33; Mk. 7 : 28; Lk. 5 : 12; Lk. 7 : 6; 18 : 41; Jn. 4 : 49; 5 : 7. In the last two texts κύριε is translated by Sir.

² κύριε υἱὸς Δαυίδ, Mt. 15 : 22; 20 : 30, 31.

³ υἱὸς Δαυίδ, Mt. 9 : 27; υἱὲ Δαυίδ, Mk. 10 : 48; Lk. 18 : 39.

⁴ υἱὲ Δαυίδ Ἰησοῦ, Mk. 10 : 47.

⁵ Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυίδ, Lk. 18 : 38.

⁶ διδάσκαλε, Mk. 9 : 17; Lk. 9 : 38.

⁷ Ἰησοῦ ἐπιστάτα, Lk. 17 : 13.

⁸ ῥαββουνί, Mk. 10 : 51.

⁹ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ, Mt. 8 : 29.

¹⁰ Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ, Mk. 1 : 24; Lk. 4 : 34.

¹¹ Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, Mk. 5 : 7; cf. Lk. 8 : 28; cf. Ac. 16 : 17.

¹² σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, Mk. 3 : 11; Lk. 4 : 41. οἶδα σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, Mk. 1 : 24; Lk. 4 : 34.

¹³ PROCKSCH, TWNT, I, p. 102.

forces they at the same time possess supernatural knowledge. This view is encountered again and again. LACTANTIUS says that the philologists call the demons such because they are the "knowing ones." "They doubtless know many future things, but not everything, since they are not permitted to know the deepest dispensation of God; they are therefore wont to clothe their answers in ambiguity."¹ JOHN OF DAMASCUS is responsible for the following pronouncement: "Now as regards the future things: neither the angels of God nor the demons know these. And yet they make predictions. The angels do so because God reveals it to them and instructs them to make it known. Hence all that they say happens. But the demons also make predictions; now because they see it happen from afar, then again by guessing at it. They therefore often lie and must not be believed, even if they often tell the truth, as we said. They are also familiar with Scripture."² We encounter the same ideas again in THOMAS AQUINAS, which we have already mentioned, and they have maintained themselves in many commentaries to the present day.³ By virtue of their supernatural knowledge the demons, according to this theory, recognized in Jesus of Nazareth the Son of God, which filled them with fear. If on the other hand one adheres to the view that possession is not caused by outside forces, but must be ascribed to immanent factors, then the special knowledge of the possessed creates a problem which many have tried to solve.

For WREDE, who believes that Jesus was a rabbi to whom the lustre of the Messiahship was later imparted by Gemeindetheologie — Jesus' Messiahship is thus dogma, not history — the matter is fairly simple. In a sharp game of cross-questions he tries to demonstrate the his-

¹ LACTANTIUS, *Div. Instit.*, II, 15: "Daemones autem grammatici dictos aiunt, quasi daëmonas, id est peritos, ac rerum scios; hos enim putant deos esse. Sciunt illi quidem futura multa, sed non omnia, quippe quibus penitus consilium Dei scire non liceat: et ideo solent responsa in ambiguos exitus temperare."

² JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *De Fide Orthodoxa* II, 4, Περὶ Διαβόλου καὶ δαιμόνων... John of Damascus (d. 749), the last and most influential Father of the Greek Church, is regarded by the Western Church as one of the predecessors of Thomas Aquinas. See BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK-LINDEBOOM, *Handboek der Kerkgeschiedenis*, I, p. 154.

³ Cf. KEULERS, Marcus en Lucas, with reference to Mk. 1 : 34. "Jesus belongs to the supernatural world, of which the spirits have a knowledge superior to that of man. According to Lk. they know that He is the Son of God and the Messiah. Jesus imposes silence on them, for He does not wish the secrets of God to be revealed by the evil spirits."

torical impossibility of confession by demons, and ends with: "I conclude as follows: these features must be removed from the actual story of Jesus. It is their very regularity which makes them suspect and betrays their origin."¹ He thus believes that these texts stem from the Messianic version of the accounts.

A second explanation leads us down quite a different trail, viz. that of parapsychology. OESTERREICH states that it is very often asserted that demoniacs possess clairvoyant and telepathic powers, as witness what is said about the possessed among the Bataks.² Livingstone is said to have found a case of prophetic possession among the Zulus. Clairvoyance is also claimed to have occurred among Russian and Chinese demoniacs. Moreover, according to OESTERREICH, we are still faced with the problem of the Delphian Pythia. Could she prophesy or not? The views of scholars are divided on this subject. Although OESTERREICH rejects a coolly negative answer such as that of rationalism, he hesitates at this complicated matter; we still do not know enough about it.³

However, MICKLEM seems to see a trail in this direction. He perceives a connection between the supranormal knowledge of the medium in trance and the possessed. He points out that during the first period of His activities Jesus "was exercised in mind as to His own Person and vocation." The healing of the possessed took place in this first period. Well then, says MICKLEM, if we see possession as "a psychological state in which the subject displays a heightened 'sensibility' similar to that manifested by a person in trance, the recognition of our Lord by the demoniacs becomes easily intelligible."⁴

¹ WREDE, *Messiasgeheimnis*, p. 31.

² OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 379 ff. WARNECK, *Lebenskräfte des Evangeliums*, p. 67 ff. Warneck gives various examples of Batak mediums and says: "Wie immer man die extatischen Zustände erkläre, soviel ist gewiss: soweit nicht einfach Betrug vorliegt, greifen in das Seelenleben des Besessenen Kräfte ein, die ihm selbst unkontrollierbar sind, seinen Willen, sein Selbstbewusstsein, sein eigenes Denken aufheben und durch eine fremde bestimmende Macht ersetzen. Bemerkenswert ist das übereinstimmende Urteil der Heidenchristen, welche die Besessenheit nicht durch Krankheit erklären, sondern darin dämonische Einwirkungen sehen, mit einer Bestimmtheit, die ihnen sonst fremd ist" (p. 71 f.).

³ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 380 ff.

⁴ MICKLEM, *op. cit.*, p. 72 ff. WEATHERHEAD, *op. cit.*, p. 68: "How did the 'demons' recognize Jesus? The patient 'possessed by a demon' is certainly in an abnormal psychological state. May he not have been able to 'read' the subconscious mind of Jesus, and thus recognize him?" LANGTON, *Essentials of Demonology*, p. 153, considers it an open question whether supernormal knowledge must be envisaged. "It may have been simply a deduction from the dominating authority

If one were to continue to embroider on this theme, one might as well speak of Jesus as a "transmitter" who influences the susceptible demoniac telepathically, or of the "tapping" of Jesus' thoughts by the demoniac; one could point to a "magnetic rapport," and so on, but all these suppositions lead us straight into the world of occultism.

BAUERNFEIND is responsible for a shrewd study of our problem. He sees the words of the demons as being at first adjurations. The demon knows Jesus, and this is his strongest defensive weapon.¹ Now together with WREDE — whose theory is incidentally rejected by BAUERNFEIND — the cardinal question is the following: is it conceivable that demoniacs addressed Jesus as the "Son of God" at a time when nobody as yet regarded Him as the Messiah?² This is possible if we interpret the pronouncements of the possessed as parts of "magic sentences." "The procedure must then have been that the sick, in a state of excitement aroused by the presence of the exorcist Jesus or by other causes, began to speak their usual magic sentences; the disciples were struck by the terms occurring therein and later recalled that Jesus was addressed on several occasions by demoniacs in words of adjuration such as 'holy one of God' and 'Son of God'."³

BAUERNFEIND remarks that one must, however, assume that the demoniacs must have addressed such Messianic pronouncements to other exorcists as well, which of course cannot be checked.⁴ This view of BAUERNFEIND's is certainly a serious attempt to find a solution to the problem "history or dogma?" posed in all sharpness by WREDE.

The question around which everything turns is therefore this: the demoniacs did in fact meet the Son of God in the person of Jesus, but did they have more knowledge of this than others? It seems to us that the various terms used by the demoniacs need not point to their having been equipped with supernatural knowledge. It is a

exercised by Jesus; or an inference drawn from some words of His that have not been reported; or from the reports which had already gained circulation concerning Him. But it may at least be said that so far as our records go, the evil spirits seem to have been the first to recognize the divine authority of Jesus."

¹ BAUERNFEIND, *Die Worte der Dämonen*, p. 34.

² BAUERNFEIND, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

³ BAUERNFEIND, *op. cit.*, p. 96. Bauernfeind therefore sees in Jesus' injunctions to silence a suppression of the demons' adjurations, p. 100, note 4. GRUNDMANN, *TWNT*, III, p. 901, shares Bauernfeind's view; the demons' words are: "zauberische Beschwörungsformeln."

⁴ BAUERNFEIND, *op. cit.*, p. 98, note 1.

known fact that some mental patients believe that in particular they themselves, but also others on occasion, are God, the devil, an emperor, a king, etc. The terms in which the demoniacs did so in the days of Jesus display a Jewish tinge: Son of God,¹ Son of the most high God, holy one of God.² Firstly these names may not simply be declared synonymous with the title of Messiah. But even if many of the possessed — for what do we really know of the symptoms of the “many” (Lk. 4 : 41) out of whom the devils came? — should have addressed Jesus as Messiah, then, in view of the state of these unfortunates, and in view of the eager expectation of the Messiah and the fame of Jesus, this would be entirely natural and explicable. Nor may we forget that the nature and the degree of possession are not known to us, so that we do not know either to what extent mass psychosis and infection may have occurred.

If the relevant accounts are studied, we everywhere find resistance,

¹ Cf. DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 219 ff.

² See DALMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 162 f. . . . In an interesting study, “Le Surnaturel et les Dieux,” DUMAS describes how mental patients, in their various forms of insanity, can supernaturalize themselves and others. Mania and melancholy: “ne sont pas créatrices de Surnaturel,” p. 87. In genuine paranoia supernaturalization occurs, p. 88 f. “Les malades déclarent être l’objet des faveurs divines, d’une attention particulière du ciel, qu’ils sont Élie ressuscité, Jésus redevenu homme, qu’ils sont chargés de livrer bataille à l’Antéchrist, ou de sauver une seconde fois l’humanité, etc.,” p. 92. Dumas mentions a number of cases of “paranoïa d’influence,” in which patients have supernaturalized their doctors and lawyers, p. 124 . . . Dumas has something important to say about a method of “defence” applied by lunatics: “qu’on pourrait appeler la défense magique.” At an earlier stage a number of scholars devoted an investigation to this. Dumas states that Ségla (Leçons cliniques sur les maladies mentales, Paris, 1895) distinguishes between three categories in this defence, viz.: language, writing and gestures. To the patient words have: “la valeur d’une conjuration.” On one occasion it is a single word, on others a curse, an expression, a neologism. The investigation into this matter is not yet concluded, and Dumas still has many questions. “Ségla nous dit que ces idées de défense ne se rencontrent guère qu’à la suite d’idées de persécution, le plus souvent systématisées et de date ancienne; il ajoute qu’on pourrait en rapprocher quelques faits très analogues observés dans d’autres formes psychopathiques telles que les obsessions. Contentons-nous de ces indications, mais qu’il nous soit permis de penser que si les malades se défendent par des procédés magiques, c’est qu’ils se sont sentis attaqués par des procédés pareils et que la persécution, dont on ne nous parle pas assez, était de la même nature que la défense; le défenseur a suivi les agresseurs sur leur terrain.” (p. 290 ff.) . . . When we compare cases of possession in the Gospels with the above, we see a remarkable similarity. In the Gospels, too, we note the feeling of menace, persecution mania, among the possessed. “Art thou come to destroy us?”, Mk. 1 : 24. “I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not,” Mk. 5 : 7. By pronouncing magic words the possessed, as “defender,” tries to deprive the “attacker,” Jesus, of His power.

defence and adjuration by the naming of the "name," the one case being more easily open to explanation than another. The possessed were therefore not keepers of a special "secret," but unfortunates whose utterances must be interpreted within the framework of the picture of their time and their symptoms. And Jesus took these persons in hand and healed them in a special manner, just as He did with other sick persons in another manner.

We have now come to the second question: in what way did Jesus approach the possessed? His methods must be compared with those of the exorcists, which means something different from calling Jesus an exorcist. Jesus addressed Himself to the demon, commanding him to release his victim. "Hold thy peace, and come out of Him."¹ "Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit."² "Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him."³ "Go."⁴ "Hold thy peace, and come out of him."⁵ Only once is it stated that Jesus addressed a question to a demon: "What is thy name?"⁶ Jesus therefore opposed His power, imperatively and reprovably,⁷ to the diabolic power which held the demoniac captive; it was His authoritative and wrathful word that brought recovery to the mentally ill.⁸

Besides the command to the spirits to come out, Jesus also imposed a ban, viz. the ban on making His name known.⁹ This injunction to silence must not be regarded in isolation, that is to say it must not only be associated with the "knowledge" of the demons, but must also be considered in a wider context. Jesus several times imposed silence upon those whom He had healed.¹⁰ For these cases

¹ Mk. 1 : 25.

² Mk. 5 : 8.

³ Mk. 9 : 25.

⁴ Mt. 8 : 32.

⁵ Lk. 4 : 35.

⁶ Lk. 8 : 30.

⁷ Lk. 4 : 41.

⁸ Cf. EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 41. STAUFFER, TWNT, II, p. 620 ff. STÄHLIN, TWNT, V, p. 428: "Der Zorn ist ein integrierender Zug im Jesusbild der Evangelien." Jesus' wrath proves that He was a man of flesh and blood: "aber es ist doch nie ein allzumenschliches Zürnen. Es trägt immer etwas von der Art des Zürnens Gottes an sich; das wird vor allem deutlich an dem, worüber und warum Jesus zürnt." Cf. for the wrath of God: VRIEZEN, *Hoofddlijnen der Theologie v.h. O.T.*, p. 166.

⁹ Mk. 1 : 34; 3 : 12. Lk. 4 : 41.

¹⁰ Mt. 8 : 4; 9 : 30 (note the Messianic-sounding "Son of David," Mt. 9 : 27); Mk. 1 : 44; 5 : 43; 8 : 26; Lk. 5 : 14 . . . In Mt. 12 : 16 Jesus forbids His being

various motives of a medical and psychological or pedagogic nature may be adduced, for instance that Jesus wanted to protect those He had healed against possible evil influences resulting from conversations with others; that He did not want miracles to form a means of conversion; that He was afraid of political outbursts, or even that Jesus was not always successful with His miracles and shrank from performing them too often, as KLAUSNER believes, etc., but these practical considerations offer no solution. Moreover, there is the explicit command to the disciples to remain silent after Peter's confession.¹ Motives can also be found for this. Jesus might have wanted to prevent a Messianic movement occurring, or He might have desired only true professors of the faith. When considering this problem we shall always have to bear in mind that the true nature of Jesus' Messiahship was concealed before His death on the cross and His resurrection. Nobody, not even Peter, understood the quintessence of the Messiahship during the life of Jesus, since it was fully revealed only after the Passion, crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. Nor could it be understood, since in the days of Jesus Judaism did not recognize the concept of a Messiah who had to suffer and die.²

Consequently, when both inimical demons and professing intimates

made known (it therefore does not only refer to the healing), to which Matthew adds the prophecy from Isa. 42 : 1-4 as motivation. The work of Jesus must continue without a sensation being made.

¹ Mt. 16 : 20 and parallel passages . . . STAUFFER, TWNT, II, p. 622, with reference to Jesus' "charging" (ἐπιτιμάω) that His Messiahship must not be made known, points to the vivid and direct form in Mk. 8 : 30, and sees in this reason to reject WREDE's interpretation that the injunction to silence was a fiction of the earliest Christians. The injunction to silence finds its cause in Jesus' conviction: "dass die Entscheidung ihre Stunde hat und nicht vorzeitig heraufbeschworen werden darf;" the revelation of His being may only "schrittweise vorangehen." According to KLIJN, *Inleiding t.h. N.T.*, p. 34 f., in the investigation of the Messianic secret one must "not only concentrate on Jesus' injunctions to silence, but one must also include those references which speak of the astonishment, the horror and the fear which Jesus' work arouses." Secrecy, astonishment and failure to understand are most intimately interconnected. It is not so much that Jesus' Messiahship must remain concealed: "but his task as Messiah is a secret, as long as he has not risen from the dead" . . . EISLER, *op. cit.*, II, p. 193 ff., has a "simple" solution for the so-called "Messianic secret." It is based on: "weltliche Klugheit und Vorsicht," for: "ein Kronanwärter ohne Anhang, der Helfer und Vertraute sucht, kann nicht ohne weiteres und vorzeitig mit seinen Ansprüchen auf dem offenen Markt hervortreten." He must drop hints, both speak in parables and act (the miraculous feeding), etc.

² VAN DER LOOS, *Jezus Messias-Koning*, p. 103 ff.

are commanded to remain silent,¹ this clearly reveals that possible pedagogic objectives of Jesus are only subsidiary to the main motive, viz. that the Messianic glory of the Son of God would be fully revealed to His followers only in His death on the cross and His resurrection. In this way the "concealment of the Messianic secret" of Jesus can also be understood as a historic fact.² CALVIN believes that there may be two reasons why Jesus imposed silence on the devils, viz. a general reason, being that the time was not yet ripe for complete revelation, and a particular one, being that Jesus did not want any proclaimers and witnesses of His divinity whose praise would only defile Him.³ The first reason points in the direction

¹ Note the similarity in the names in Lk. 4 : 41: Christ the Son of God and in Mt. 16 : 16, 20: Christ, the Son of the living God.

² DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 297, points out that there is a tension between the deeds of Jesus and His end. "Je mehr man in Taten und Worten die Fülle der Offenbarung darstellte, desto rätselhafter und unbegreiflicher wurde die endliche Verwerfung dieser Offenbarung durch das Volk, das damit begnadigt war. Markus löste diese Spannung durch die Theorie des Messiasgeheimnisses; er stellte nicht nur jene grossen Wundertaten, sondern das ganze Wirken Jesu unter den Gesichtspunkt der geheimen Epiphanie." Or, in other words, the Gospel of Mark is determined by Christology. But this does not have to lead to a "Theorie des Messiasgeheimnisses" devised and applied by the Evangelist; no, it was the "secret" of Jesus Himself, i.e. the injunction to silence existed because the complete revelation was to take place only in His death on the cross and His resurrection. Thus, it was not Mark who approached Jesus' ministry from the "point of view of the secret epiphany;" this has a historical foundation. RIDDERBOS, *Paulus en Jezus*, recalls Jesus' pronouncement: the Son of man must suffer many things. "These words contain the whole mystery of Jesus' earthly Messiahship: the one destined for glory must (first) undergo suffering and death and therefore, besides the motif of revelation, there is also the motif of concealment" (p. 35). GOPPELT, *Christentum u. Judentum*, p. 57 ff. The "Verhüllung" is: "nicht Taktik, sondern eine Ausprägung der grundsätzlichen gnädigen Verborgenheit der endzeitlichen Offenbarung, die aber zugleich verblendende Verhüllung für den Unglauben sein soll." TUINSTRRA, *Het Symbool in de Psychanalyse*, p. 222 ff., points to the duality of revelation and mystery, just as we also encounter them in the parables. "In the person of Jesus we come up against the unmistakable characteristics of the functional nature of the symbolic. The purpose is: to conceal . . . God manifests Himself in the form of a human being, but the very result of this is that He must conceal Himself, for His being cannot be expressed in human shape."

³ CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mk. 1 : 34: "Duplex potuit esse ratio cur non sineret: una generalis, quod nondum maturum plenae revelationis tempus advenerat: altera specialis, quam nuper attigimus, quod illos repudiabat praecones ac testes suae divinitatis, qui laude sua nihil aliud quam maculam et sinistram opinionem aspergere illi poterant." Ad Mt. 12 : 16: "Sed paulatim in lucem prodiit, ac per certos gradus: nec aliter patefactus est qualis erat, quam ferebat ordinatum a Patre tempus." Cf. THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa Theologiae*, III, qu. XLIV, art. I. Jesus forbade the demons to speak: 1. so that we should

of the view reproduced above; we consider the particular reason incorrect, since we are not concerned with profession and homage, but with adjuration. To sum up, we may say:

- (a) The cause of the fact that the demoniacs, in the manner in which they address Jesus, differ from the ordinary sick, must not be sought in a supernatural knowledge prompted by demons, but in their attempts to adjure the power of Jesus (*Bauernfeind*); attention must be paid here to the Jewish colouring of the terms used.
- (b) The parapsychological view contains too many improbabilities to offer an acceptable explanation.
- (c) Wrede's theory that dogma on Jesus has overgrown the true story of Jesus has, we believe, been adequately refuted in our argument.
- (d) Jesus' activities should be regarded against the background of the practices of exorcists in those days; however, it is not correct to put Jesus on a level with them or to call Him an exorcist.
- (e) The imposition of silence upon the demons must not be interpreted as a rejection of the homage paid by the devils, but must be seen in the light of the other impositions of silence by Jesus. Consequently the ban on the demons' speaking may not be adduced as proof of supernatural knowledge on the part of the possessed.

(c) HEALING OF THE POSSESSED

1. *Introduction*

The Gospels do not only mention separate cases of the healing of demoniacs; they are also always listed among the diseases which Jesus healed.¹ The fact that they are always given separately indicates that the demoniacs were regarded as special victims, whilst it may also imply that not every disease was ascribed to the direct influence of evil spirits. The evil spirit that causes possession is referred to

not be instructed by the devil; 2. His praise may not be spread by the "stinking tongue" (*lingua foetida*); 3. because Jesus did not want the envy of the Jews to flare up as a result of this.

¹ Mt. 4 : 24; 8 : 16; Mk. 1 : 32; Lk. 4 : 41 . . . In the Old Testament Saul and Nebuchadnezzar are described as mentally disturbed, whilst David once simulated lunacy (1 Sa. 21 : 14) . . . שִׁנְעוֹר, lunacy, קִשְׁנֵעַ, lunatic.

under several names. Only once does "daimon" occur,¹ whereas we frequently encounter the term "daimonion."² The demon is also designated simply by "spirit", *pneuma*³, whilst we further encounter him in various compound forms, viz. "evil spirit;"⁴ "unclean [foul] spirit;"⁵ "dumb spirit;"⁶ "dumb and deaf spirit;"⁷ "spirit of an unclean devil."⁸ Reference is also made to a "spirit of infirmity,"⁹ whilst Acts mentions a "spirit of divination."¹⁰ In the other books of the New Testament we several times come across the terms *pneuma* and *daimonion*.

Now what kind of people were those who were possessed by a demon? To what circles did they belong? What, in each case, was the cause and the nature of their disease? Did possession by infection occur in some cases? These are a number of questions which are not easy to answer, having regard to the scanty data. It is obvious to assume that these victims were for the greater part just ordinary people. OESTERREICH points out that the possessed belong almost without exception to the uneducated classes.¹¹ He states that possession

¹ δαίμων, devil, Mt. 8 : 31.

² δαιμόνιον, daemonium, דַּיְמוֹן. Mt. 7 : 22; 9 : 33, 34; 10 : 8; 11 : 18; 12 : 24, 27, 28; 17 : 18 (19). Mk. 1 : 34, 39; 3 : 15, 22; 6 : 13; 7 : 26, 29, 30; 9 : 38; 16 : 9. Lk. 4 : 35, 41; 7 : 33; 8 : 2, 27, 29, 30, 33, 35, 38; 9 : 1, 42, 49; 10 : 17; 11 : 14, 15, 18, 19, 20; 13 : 32; Jn. 8 : 48, 49; 10 : 21. Cf. 1 Co. 10 : 20; Jas. 2 : 19. Besides this we also find forms of the verb δαιμονίζομαι, to be possessed by a demon, in Mt. 4 : 24; 8 : 16, 28, 33; 9 : 32; 12 : 22; 15 : 22. Mk. 1 : 32; 5 : 15, 16, 18; Lk. 8 : 36; Jn. 10 : 21. Lk. 8 : 27 has "had" devils. HANSE, TWNT, II, p. 821. ἔχειν, to have, is also used as "das dämonische Haben sensu malo;" it expresses "nur ein räumliches Verhältnis . . . = in sich tragen." Cf. Mt. 11 : 18, Lk. 7 : 33.

³ πνεῦμα, spiritus, רוּחַ. Mt. 8 : 16; 12 : 45; Mk. 9 : 20; Lk. 9 : 39; 10 : 20; 11 : 26; cf. Ac. 16 : 18.

⁴ πνεῦμα πονηρόν, spiritus malus, רֶעָה רוּחַ. Lk. 7 : 21; 8 : 2, cf. Ac. 19 : 12 ff. Ad πονηρός, see HARDER, TWNT, VI, p. 546 ff.

⁵ πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, spiritus immundus, טִמְאָה רוּחַ. Mt. 10 : 1; 12 : 43. Mk. 1 : 23, 26, 27; 3 : 11; 3 : 30; 5 : 2, 8, 13; 6 : 7; 7 : 25; 9 : 25, foul. Lk. 4 : 36; 6 : 18; 8 : 29; 9 : 42; 11 : 24. Cf. Ac. 5 : 16; 8 : 7. Rev. 16 : 13; 18 : 2, foul. Zech. 13 : 2; Testament of Benjamin 5 : 2.

⁶ πνεῦμα ἄλαλον, spiritus mutus: Mk. 9 : 17.

⁷ τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα, surde et mute spiritus: Mk. 9 : 25; cf. Lk. 11 : 14.

⁸ ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου, habens daemonium immundum: Lk. 4 : 33.

⁹ πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας, spiritus infirmitatis: Lk. 13 : 11.

¹⁰ πνεῦμα πύθωνα, spiritum pithonem: Ac. 16 : 16.

¹¹ OESTERREICH, op. cit., pp. 96, 118. Oesterreich states that possession nowadays still occurs most in Russia. It is called *Ikôta*, i.e. "expelled." It is a peasant woman's disease. Possession also occurs in East European Jewry. Considerable

is not related to a certain age, though it does occur most among women. Epidemics of it occur almost always in nunneries.¹

In his extensive study OESTERREICH has tried to give as accurate a picture of possession as possible. In the introduction to his book he says: "The book which is usually the first to acquaint those of us who belong to the European zone of culture with the conditions designated as 'possession' is the New Testament. The accounts given in it do in fact offer in many a respect a correct picture of these conditions, which occurred very frequently in late Antiquity."² OESTERREICH is of the opinion that possession is vividly portrayed; the accounts tally exactly with those from later days. He makes a striking comment on this: "It may incidentally be remarked that respect for the content of historical truth in the Gospels increases greatly. If we leave the incident of the Gadarene swine out of consideration, the accounts bear a completely realistic and objective stamp."³

A study of the phenomenon of possession is most greatly hampered by the fact that we only have a few autobiographies available. However, there are more to be found on ecstatic states.⁴

possession is also found among the lower classes of India and of China. Egypt has the Zar, originating in Abyssinia, a form of possession which resides particularly in women and which according to Oesterreich has become a little of a women's sport. See the extensive survey in Oesterreich, p. 192 ff. Cf. JEANMAIRE, *Dionysos*, Ch. IV, La "Mania" Divine, 2: Culture et traitement de la possession à l'époque contemporaine: le Zar et le Bori, pp. 119-131. These are religious or semi-religious movements over a wide area: N. Africa, Egypt, Tripoli, Tunisia, Arabia, Abyssinia and part of the Sudan. They are still spreading among both white and coloured people, and have only recently become a subject of research. "Les esprits en question, d'après les principaux observateurs, sont désignés sous le nom de bori (qui appartient à une langue soudanaise) dans la partie ouest de l'aire d'extension précédemment esquissée et sous celui de zar (sar) dans la partie orientale et, notamment, en Egypte et en Abyssinie. Les origines sont obscures (Afrique noire ou Orient musulman), de même que la façon dont le mouvement a cheminé" (p. 121). MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 63, reports the answer which Nevius received from a Chinese in Peking with reference to his investigation into the matter: "Cases of possession are less frequent in peaceful times and more frequent in times of civil commotion; less frequent in prosperous families, more so in unlucky ones; less frequent among educated people, and more so among the ignorant."

¹ OESTERREICH, op. cit., p. 118; p. 142: on possession principally among the women of the Bantu tribes in S. Africa; p. 182 ff.: epidemics of possession in convents and orphanages; p. 217: in China women mostly suffer from animal possession.

² OESTERREICH, op. cit., p. 3.

³ OESTERREICH, op. cit., p. 4.

⁴ OESTERREICH, op. cit., p. 11 ff.

The most striking aspect of possession is that the patient seems to be in the power of another personality; the demoniac seems to have become a "double" individual. This "dédoublement de la personnalité," dual personality, makes itself felt in various forms: in the facial expression, in the bearing and in particular in the voice which the "other" uses.¹ The normal ego is ousted by the other "ego," as we can read in the New Testament.² However, the subject often loses all consciousness of his individuality. According to OESTERREICH, the situation in these cases, which seem to form far and away the majority, is entirely different from what theological research assumes.³ The possessed person is in a somnambulistic state; the primary consciousness of personality is replaced by a second one. Besides this somnambulistic form there is a second one, viz. the lucid form, in which the patient retains his awareness of his normal personality.⁴ OESTERREICH rejects the idea that "spirit" comes to reside in spirit, i.e. he rejects a metaphysical splitting of the ego. We must not think of dualism, but of a compulsive idea, in which one and the same subject is possessed by two groups of emotions. The obsession is thus a compulsive idea.⁵ It comes into being when two states of mind existing simultaneously dominate a man, creating the impression of a split or divided personality, with the compulsive processes forming the immediate centre.⁶ Possession can also be caused by contact

¹ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 19, quotes P. Janet, *Névroses et Idées fixes*, I, p. 384: "C'était un spectacle bien extraordinaire pour nous autres qui étions là présents que de voir ce méchant esprit s'exprimer par la bouche de cette pauvre femme et d'entendre tantôt le son d'une voix mâle, tantôt le son d'une voix féminine, mais si distinctes l'une de l'autre que l'on ne pouvait croire que cette femme parlât seule." The new voice is not that of the normal individual; but of the "other."

² Cf. DEISSMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 113 f., on the "I-style" of demons.

³ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 30, rejects the view of VON HARNACK, *Medizinisches etc.*, p. 105.

⁴ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 37 ff.

⁵ There is a difference between *obsessio* and *possessio*. *Obsessio* literally means occupation, siege; *possessio* is to take possession, make one's property. BLESS, *Pastoraal Psychiatrie*, p. 102, gives the following definition: "The devil can, with God's permission, also take possession of the human body and its senses. The latter is what we understand by demoniac occupancy or possession. We call this demoniac activity *obsessio* if it occurs without disturbance of reason and *possessio* if reason and will are also disturbed by it."

⁶ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 88. . . KOCH, *Seelsorge u. Okkultismus*, p. 196: "Das Wesen des Besessenheitszustandes ist damit bei Oesterreich auf eine anti-transzendente, tiefenpsychologische Basis reduziert." KOCH extols Oesterreich's varied material, and remarks: "Das wichtigste Moment ist die Feststellung, dass bei aller mehr oder weniger nachgewiesenen Immanenz der B. Phänomene die

with the possessed. The root of the infection is not, however, this contact with the possessed, but belief both in the demoniac nature of possession and in the possibility of its being communicable.¹ Possession can also be caused by a hallucination.² The "autosuggestion of possession" plays a major role, in particular among the uneducated. As regards the healing of the possessed by exorcism, OESTERREICH remarks: "The stories of the Gospels on this point are characteristic of the method of exorcism used in all times."³ Exorcism is suggestive in nature, for it is the converse of the origin of possession. Further there is little that can be said about it. After all, we cannot measure the changes within the psyche.⁴ However, the more vigorous the suggestive, authoritative action of the exorcist is, the more chance there will be of success.

OESTERREICH mentions that suggestion does not always help, and that it must sometimes even be accompanied by violent measures.⁵ It must, he says, be "the belief of the possessed himself" that helps him.⁶ OESTERREICH associates the influence of the belief in demons in Judaism not only with the highly religious life of the Jews but also with a certain pathological disposition of the people. The Jewish nation displays hysterical traits, caused by all kinds of unfavourable factors, which lead to neuroses.⁷ We shall leave aside

Tür offen bleibt für die mögliche Existenz transzendenter Wirkungszentren. Mehr kann der Theologe vom Philosophen und Psychologen wahrhaftig nicht verlangen" (p. 229).

¹ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 89. In particular the priests who expelled the demons were prone to infection . . . As a serious fit of hysteria resembles classic possession—Charcot consequently speaks of the *attaque démoniaque*—a relationship can be seen between these two, but generalization must be guarded against. For were all the possessed, including those of the epidemics, hysterical? Mentally normal persons can also be infected. The excitement, fear, etc., arouse an auto-suggestible state. The people in those cases did not become hysterical. We should rather think of mass psychology here, cf. OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 184 f. VON HARNACK, *Mission u. Ausbreitung*, p. 136.

² OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

³ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 96.

⁴ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 96. . . . The term exorcists occurs only in Ac. 19 : 13. See SCHNEIDER, *TWNT*, V, p. 465 f.

⁵ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 103. KOTY, *Die Behandlung der Alten u. Kranken b.d. Naturvölkern* p. 57, states that a tribe in Central Asia, the Taranchi, "expelled" a demon of disease so drastically for a period of three days that a patient rarely survived the treatment.

⁶ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁷ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 166 f. Cf. WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, *op. cit.*, p. 125: "The Jews, with their wonderful excess of vital power, suffer much from nervous irritability at the present time and with them this is no new disease.

the question of whether this diagnosis of the Jewish people is correct, but doubtless nervous tension increases in stirring times, and the minds of many are disturbed, whilst one race is more suggestible than another. EBSTEIN stresses the great excitement which the new doctrine of Jesus caused, and remarks: "At any moment the most exciting states of agitation can occur under the influence of religious ecstasy, even in our days." He recalls the St. Vitus' Dance in Germany and the tarantella in Italy. He does not wish it to be incorrectly thought that he is attempting to draw a parallel between possession in the New Testament and the dancing mania which he mentions, but he perceives an analogy in the aetiology, the symptomatology and the strikingly rapid cures in both cases.¹

We must further consider the point of suggestion here, since the suggestion theory is repeatedly encountered. EBSTEIN states that mental treatment, suggestion, plays a leading role in healing, though we must bear in mind, he adds, that the word suggestion serves as a terminus technicus to designate a complicated mental event, but does not explain in what way such healings come about.²

We have already rejected the view that Jesus was a suggestive therapist. The Jewish scholar KLAUSNER characterizes Jesus as a personality with a suggestive force "to an unusual extent." He argues: "Yet it is clear that many nervous cases and hysterical women were completely cured through Jesus' amazing, hypnotic, personal influence."³ FENNER discusses in detail the pros and cons of the

The New Testament reveals the widespread neurotic conditions which prevailed at the time of Christ, and from all we know of the moral life of the pagan world at the beginning of the Christian Era it is plain that Graeco-Roman society was even more deeply affected." FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 76. . . SCHLIER, *Mächte u. Gewalten im NT*, p. 39, believes that the Gospels themselves indicate the reason for the large number of possessed: "dort, wo der gehorsame Jesus Christus erscheint, weiss sich das Wesen der Selbstmächtigkeit aufgestört und gestellt zum Gericht."

¹ EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 60 ff. FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 78, is opposed to the view of Stoll (*Hypnotismus u. Suggestion in der Völkerpsychologie*, 1904, p. 242), that the miracles of Jesus stirred up a psychical epidemic. "Aber dass die dadurch verursachte starke Erregung zu ihrer weiteren Ausbreitung beigetragen haben wird, ist wohlbegreiflich. Vielleicht erklärt sich so Jesu Schweigegebot." We have already said that we ascribe Jesus' injunction to silence to quite different motives.

² EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 64 f. DE JONG, *Oosters-Hellenistische mysteriën*, p. 40, gives the following definition of suggestion: "By 'suggestion' in the broad sense should be understood—as is finding increasing acceptance—a mental influence which uses no rational motivation as agent."

³ KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 270. Cf. FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 68: "Zur Erklärung der neutestamentlichen Dämonenbeschwörungen kommt vor allem

suggestion theory. We are not yet certain about this, he says. FENNER wants to bridge the gap between Biblical Antiquity and the present day. "This happens," he says, "when that which reveals itself in the New Testament in the healings of Jesus and of the apostles, theologically speaking, as a divine force that fills them is explained from the medical point of view as suggestion."¹ If for Jesus "a 'singular miraculous power' is not postulated, nothing stands in the way of interpreting the healings in the New Testament as suggestive healings as well."² In this connection he points to verbal suggestion in modern psychiatry, particularly by means of threatening and frightening. Psychiatry obtains characteristic results with this stern technique.³ In MICKLEM, too, we find a leaning towards the suggestion theory. He remarks that to assess the cases in the New Testament properly we should above all note that a man under suggestion loses his critical faculty. In a crowd suggestibility is increased. MICKLEM refers to the pronouncement of a doctor that collective treatment creates a "curative atmosphere."⁴ This might therefore apply to the cases in which the possessed approached Jesus in numbers. MICKLEM also tries to bridge the gap between the New Testament and present-day science, but is too halfhearted: on the one hand he recognizes an analogy, but on the other hand he does not at bottom regard the healings of Jesus as suggestion, but sees them in connection with His life of prayer.⁵

We should take care not to identify with one another things that display a similarity. We should no more doubt the success of many exorcists of earlier and later times than the numerous good results of modern psychiatry. But to judge correctly we must in each case know what exactly happened; we should have to know the exact symptoms of the mental patient and we should have to check whether

die Kraft der Suggestion in Betracht, also der gewaltige Eindruck der Persönlichkeit Jesu." TRAUB, *Wunder im N.T.*, 39. RENAN, *Vie de Jésus*, p. 274: "De nos jours, en Syrie, on regarde comme fous ou possédés d'un démon (ces deux idées n'en font qu'une, *medjnoun*) des gens qui ont seulement quelque bizarrerie. Une douce parole suffit souvent dans ce cas pour chasser le démon. Tels étaient sans doute les moyens employés par Jésus." According to RENAN "to have a devil," cf. Mt. 11 : 18, means nothing more than "You are crazy;" cf. the Arabic expression: "*medjnoun enté*."

¹ FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

² FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 103.

³ FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

⁴ MICKLEM, *Miracles*, p. 10 f.

⁵ MICKLEM, *op. cit.*, p. 130 ff.

a lasting cure was effected or not. We have already said that the data of the Gospels are extremely scanty. However, we can deduce from a number of data that the one case was more serious than the other. But what is true of all cases — and a heavy stress falls on this! — is that Jesus healed the possessed. If the suggestion theory is to be adhered to, then it must be presumed that in the case of all the demoniacs the process went as follows: the first and only meeting with Jesus brought about such a sudden turn in the psychosomatic state of the patient that he was immediately healed. However, in that case there could not have been any organic defects in any of the many possessed, since then the suggestion theory does not hold water.

We do not need to discuss here the persuasion method occasionally applied in psychotherapy, since not a single account states that Jesus helped the possessed by reasoning with them.

The striking resemblances in some respects may therefore not suggest to us that we are concerned with similar cases. When Jesus expels the demons, in other words releases the mentally sick from their unhappy state, something happens of an entirely individual and different order, viz. a manifestation of the power of the Kingdom of God, a revelation of the power of the Son of God against that of evil.¹

In our opinion the healing of the possessed can only be included among the "miracles," and we share KAFKA's view that for a genuine "miracle" the concepts suggestion and autosuggestion should be entirely ruled out. And because here the power of God becomes manifest, all analogy is out of the question.

In the following treatment of accounts in which a number of cases of healing are discussed more thoroughly by the Evangelists, we are not concerned with a fully detailed exegesis, but with what is directly relevant to our investigation.

2. *The demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum*

The account of the man with an unclean spirit is to be found in Mk. 1 : 21-28 and Lk. 4 : 31-37. Capernaum formed "the centre of Jesus' activities by the Sea."² Those present in the synagogue

¹ J. JEREMIAS, *Jesus als Weltvollender*, p. 60: "Die Dämonen austreibungen Jesu sind Einbrüche der künftigen Gottesherrschaft in die Gegenwart."

² DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 159 . . . According to BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 223, we are concerned in Mk. 1 : 21-28 with a "Wunder-

were amazed at Jesus' doctrine, in which an authority was evident that was quite different from that of the scribes. "Straightway," says Mark in some versions, there was a man in their midst with an unclean spirit. The word "straightway" is not to be found in Luke, and in the context it is incomprehensible. On the analogy of some manuscripts BRUCE therefore omits it.¹ The man was "with an unclean spirit," or according to Luke "had a spirit of an unclean devil," i.e. was in the power of, possessed by, an unclean spirit; the man was as it were captive in the unclean spirit.²

Did the demoniac perhaps attend part or possibly the whole of the service in the synagogue, or did he suddenly appear? It may be assumed that he noticed the surprise of those present, whilst he knew that the speaker was Jesus. This latter point is of great importance for an understanding of the beginning of his outburst. "What have we to do with thee, thou Jesus of Nazareth? art thou come to destroy us?" Jesus' activities have induced a state of excitement in him; he has perceived in Jesus a more than ordinary power through which he feels himself threatened.

A comparison with Judg. 11 : 12: "What hast thou to do with me, that thou art come against me to fight in my land;?" with 2 Sa. 19 : 22: "What have I to do with you, ye sons of Zeruijah, that ye should this day be adversaries unto me?;" and with 1 Ki. 17 : 18: "What have I to do with thee, O thou man of God?;"³ demonstrates that the demoniac here uses accepted terms of opposition.⁴ BAUERNFEIND sees a link between 1 Ki. 17 : 18 and Mk. 1 : 24, whilst he also points to a reference in Philo which, however, relates not to demoniac possession but to divine inspiration.⁵ It is clear that we are concerned here with defence and resistance, with words with a "magic" meaning.⁶

geschichte;" according to DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 40, with a paradigm "minder reinen Typs."

¹ BRUCE, in *The Expositor's Greek Testament*.

² Mk. 1 : 23, ἄνθρωπος ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ. Lk. 4 : 33, ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου. GOULD, *St. Mark*, says that this "in" has the same meaning as "in Christ," viz. "as somehow ensphering each other." See also SCHLIER, *Mächte u. Gewalten im NT*, p. 21.

³ Judg. 11 : 12 and 1 Ki. 17 : 18, מַה-לִּי וְלָךְ. 2 Sa. 19 : 22, מַה-לִּי לָכֶם.

⁴ But see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, on Jn. 2 : 4.

⁵ BAUERNFEIND, *op. cit.*, p. 3 ff.

⁶ BAUERNFEIND, *op. cit.*, p. 28. Cf. HAUCK, *Markus*. SCHNIEWIND, *Das NTD*, I, 1, p. 51. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 223, note 1: "Bauernfeinds Versuch, die Worte der Dämonen nicht als Messiasbekenntnisse,

The demoniac speaks of himself in the plural form, and many exegetes wish to relate this to the demons, who are frightened of their downfall. "The diseased man speaks for the demon in him, and the demon speaks for the fraternity as all having one interest."¹ The demon uses the plural form; he speaks for demons in general: their world feels itself threatened.² However, it is questionable whether the plural form here must be confined to the demons. For nothing stands in the way of the view that the demoniac summarizes by "we" all those on his field of view; that he sees a general danger present in Jesus.³ When the agitation of the demoniac is regarded in the light of the dismay and turmoil in the synagogue, this is even the obvious interpretation. The demoniac goes on in the singular: "I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God." He wants to state that he knows that Jesus of Nazareth is in reality the Holy One of God. By speaking this name the demoniac opposes power to power; his knowledge of the true name must adjuce the power of his opponent. He does not profess Jesus to be the Messiah; on the contrary, his "knowledge" is meant as a defensive weapon. Jesus deals with His unfortunate "opponent" in the manner then usual; He drives out the unclean spirit by chastisement and command: "Hold thy peace, and come out of him."⁴ Although Jesus' actions display a similarity to those of the exorcists, they are still of an entirely individual nature. Jesus does not make His name known; He says nothing about His relation to God — many magicians identified themselves with some deity of the other and tried to intimidate the possessed with: I am Hermes, Helios, Osiris, etc.⁵ — and does

sondern als 'Abwehr'-Worte zu verstehen, wie wir von solchen ja aus anderen Traditionen auch wissen (vgl. Bauernfeind S. 8, 2), scheint mir hier Mk 1, 24 geglückt zu sein." BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 256, thinks that we are concerned here with: "Ein Bekenntnis in Form des jämmerlichen Geschreis eines schon zur Flucht gezwungenen Heeres! Das ist — auch in den anderen Texten — das Wort der Dämonen." It was manifest in Jesus' presence: "dass das Chaos *nichts* zu melden, *nichts* für seine Sache vorzubringen hat."

¹ BRUCE, op. cit., with reference to Mk. 1 : 24.

² VAN LEEUWEN, Markus. MICKLEM, op. cit., p. 51, thinks that "we" refers to the man and the demons or to the demons only.

³ Cf. EBSTEIN, Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud, p. 60: "Da war ein hoher Grad von Erregung, von Hass und Begeisterung, eine Ekstase der Gemüter sondergleichen in weiten Schichten des Volkes unabweisbar."

⁴ SCHNEIDER, TWNT, II, p. 677. In the Synoptists ἐξέρχεται is the typical word used to designate the coming out of demons. Jesus is therefore not beginning a conversation, but commanding; see VON AMMON, Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu, I, p. 382.

⁵ EITREM, op. cit., pp. 6, 7, 24. FRÖVIG, Selbstbewusstsein Jesu, p. 95. Jesus

not perform a single magic action,¹ but speaks only a few words. In His command His power and will manifest themselves against the "power" that holds the spirit of the sick person captive. PERELS, who divides this account into attack, counterattack and victory for Jesus, rightly sees the climax in the "hold thy peace."²

Why must the man hold his peace? Must Jesus' command be interpreted as a preamble to healing: hold thy peace — and come out of him? Above all it must not be forgotten that the man combated the new doctrine in the synagogue at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry. EITREM speaks here of a "so to say programmatic healing,"³ whilst HAITJEMA points to the choice of the moments "at which the writers of the Gospels tell us of the most striking cases of healing of demoniacs." "Immediately after highlights in the earthly life of Jesus the power of evil takes violent action against the Lord in a desperate offensive which in unique fashion is aimed against the Redeemer and his world of light."⁴

"And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him." After the words of Jesus the demoniac suffered a violent attack — the spirit tore him⁵ — he cried out and was silent. The man was brought to himself and healed.

Now is this a case of hysteria, as TRAUB and FENNER would have us believe?⁶ BRUCE thinks that the attack of convulsions points

never used the names of God, angels or patriarchs. "Als gewöhnliche Beschwörungen lassen sich also die Dämonen-Austreibungen Jesu nicht auffassen." Cf. STAUFFER, TWNT, II, p. 343, for the self-proclamation of gods and prophets, but also of swindlers in the ancient East.

¹ JUSTIN, *Dial. cum Tryph.*, c. 85, reproaches the exorcists with banishing devils with artificial means, perfumes and fetters.

² PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 31.

³ EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 8. . . . LIGHTFOOT, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, p. 21, is convinced that the word of the demon ἡλθεσ ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς "is not a question, but a statement," i.e. "thou art come to destroy us;" and it is possible that St. Mark has assigned this very prominent position to this story, the first of its kind in this gospel, because he wishes to emphasize that one great purpose of the coming of Messiah was the destruction of the powers of evil—in the present case, spiritual evil."

⁴ HAITJEMA, *Dogmatiek als Apologie*, p. 196 f.

⁵ Mk. uses in 1 : 26 a word, σπαράσσω, which also occurs in medical writers. "It is used in medical writers of the convulsive action of the stomach in retching," according to GOULD, *St. Mark. Lk.* 4 : 35 has the addition: "and hurt him not", which points to accurate observation; the possessed sometimes used to injure themselves.

⁶ TRAUB, *op. cit.*, p. 34; FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 46. SCHÄFER, *Jesus in psychiatischer Beleuchtung*, p. 63.

to epilepsy,¹ whilst DEHN defines the symptoms as being those of epileptoid hysteria.² It is impossible to give a correct diagnosis, and in a case such as this, where doctors themselves are extremely cautious, theologians should be doubly on their guard!³

Perhaps an outburst such as that of this demoniac may be regarded as EBSTEIN sees it (as an attack of rage at the new doctrine of Jesus) and must at the same time be viewed in the light of the attacks of frenzy of demoniacs who, particularly on feast days, disturbed services in the churches.⁴ The account concludes with the statement that those present were amazed at Jesus' authority in word and deed. This "amazement," as terminus technicus in the "miracle style," need in no way make the story suspect, but may be regarded as the logical consequence of the situation.

3. *The Gadarene demoniac*

The story of the Gadarene demoniac, which is told in most detail by Mark 5 : 1-20; cf. Mt. 8 : 28-34 and Lk. 8 : 26-39, was relegated to the land of fables at quite an early stage.⁵ The enemy and opponent of Christianity PORPHYRY pours scorn on it with these words: "O fairy tale, O empty talk, O truly broad laughter!"⁶ The English deist WOOLSTON makes the sarcastic comment that we nowhere read that the owners of the swine were indemnified by Jesus and

¹ BRUCE, op. cit., "He appears to have been an epileptic."

² DEHN, Der Gottessohn. SCHNIEWIND, Das NTD, I, 1, p. 51: "Man wird bei diesen Kranken an Nervenkrankheit denken, die mit einer Veränderung des Ich-Bewusstseins verbunden ist."

³ Cf. the chapter: Miracles and Medicine.

⁴ EBSTEIN, op. cit., p. 60. OESTERREICH, op. cit., p. 6 ff. Cf. VON AMMON, Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu, I, p. 382: "Extatische und geistesirre Personen besuchen mit der allen Betörten eignen Neugierde die öffentlichen Versammlungen gern und unterbrechen dann auch den geistlichen Redner zuweilen plötzlich, wenn sie von der Lebhaftigkeit seines Vortrages ergriffen werden." STRAUSS, Das Leben Jesu, II, 49 f., does consider the healing of the demoniac in the synagogue possible. "Denn sehen wir als die wirkliche Grundlage des Zustandes der Dämonischen eine Art von Verrückung mit kramphafter Stimmung des Nervensystems an, so wissen wir, dass auf psychische und Nervenkrankheiten am ehesten auch psychisch einzuwirken ist, eine Einwirkung, zu welcher bei dem überwiegenden Ansehen Jesu als Propheten und später selbst als des Messias alle Bedingungen vorhanden waren." However, Strauss considers mental influence out of the question in the case of the Gadarene demoniac and the epileptic boy.

⁵ W. BAUER, Das Leben Jesu, p. 455 f. . . . BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 224, classifies Mk. 5 : 1-21 among the "Wundergeschichten," and DIBELIUS, Die Formgeschichte, p. 68, among the "Novellen."

⁶ VON HARNACK, Porphyrius, p. 76. Makar., III, 4: "ὁ μῦθος, ὃ λῆρος, ὃ γέλως ὄντως πλατύς."

that in the questioning of Jesus no "false witness" would have been needed at all if the story had really happened.¹ Modern minds often take umbrage at this story, too.² Nobody will deny that the story confronts us with many a question. Four of them spring to mind forthwith.

(a) There is no certainty about the setting. Matthew speaks of "the country of the Gergesenes," whereas Mark and Luke state that it was "the country of the Gadarenes." If the motives for this story are considered to lie elsewhere, or if it is viewed as being mainly constructed as a classic miracle story, the locality may be regarded as being of secondary importance.³ T. Reinach believes that the reason for the name "legion" being chosen for the unclean spirits and the swine lies in a confusion with the tenth Roman legion, which was stationed in Palestine in 70-135 A.D., and which had the emblem of a wild boar on its banners.⁴ ORIGEN, maintaining the historicity, rejected Gadara and opted for Gergesa.⁵ DALMAN, who carefully investigated the location, and considered all kinds of possibilities, most favours Kurse or Gurse, although no town was located on the mountain there.⁶

¹ WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, p. (34) f.

² DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*. BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENGEL, *Markus*, p. 107, comments: "Possibly many a person, on reading this, has thought to himself: if only Mark had not handed it down." The account looks so "medieval."

³ See KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, p. 47.

⁴ According to T. Reinach in *Revue des études Juives*, 47, p. 177. See KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 293. Cf. WINTER, *On the Trial of Jesus*. Winter perceives in the use of the word *λεγιών* an anti-Roman tendency. The *Legio Decima Fretensis* was stationed in Galilee: "near the place where the story in Mk. 5 1-13 has its locale. The emblem of the Tenth Roman Legion was a boar. Though it would be absurd to make definite assertions, it is quite possible that the story of the Gerasene swine assumed its present form during the years of the Jewish-Roman war. Could it have been occasioned by an incident in which some Roman legionaries took a swim in the Lake of Tiberias and were drowned? Although a definite answer cannot be given to this question, a note of malicious joy over the unfortunate fate of Legion is unmistakable. The Latin name was not chosen by accident" (p. 129).

⁵ In his commentary on Jn. VI, 24. See SMIT, *op. cit.*, p. 317.

⁶ DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 192. "Nun haftet der Name Kurse jetzt an einer kleinen Ortslage am Strande südlich von der Mündung des wadi-es-samak, und mit gurse wird in ihrer Nähe am Abhang eines Bergvorsprungs eine Turmruine bezeichnet. Das Örtchen liegt auf einem sehr kleinen, wohl durch Trümmer entstandenen Hügel, ein grosses Mauerviereck, dass doch keine Ortslage bedeutet, ein Stück davon landeinwärts," p. 190. Cf. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 282 ff. El Kursi is the Biblical Gerasa . . . Agreement has still not been reached on the location. KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 296, considers Gadara, "the modern Um-Kais," the most probable. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 490: "Gadara, גַּדָּרָה,"

(b) A second difficulty is that Matthew speaks of two demoniacs, whereas Mark and Luke have only one. Various suppositions evince a gift for ingenious explanation and an effort to bring the accounts into line with one another: it is thought that Matthew's memory let him down. For it must be remembered that Matthew tells us nothing about the demoniac at Capernaum, which he endeavours to make up for here by speaking of two demoniacs.¹ Another explanation is that there were two demoniacs, but Mark mentioned only the more serious case.² A third is that the couple stresses the numerousness of the demons. But none of these hypotheses gives a satisfactory explanation. PERELS says that the account of the two demons is secondary, whilst BULTMANN is reminded of a popular manner of narration, viz. the search for symmetry.³ But all these solutions

zur Dekapolis gehörig, südöstlich vom See Genezareth." ALLEN, *St. Matthew*, considers the Gerasa of Mark "a geographical crux"; Mt. seems to have sensed the difficulty and therefore changed the name to Gadara. "This city lay 6 miles southeast of the lake, and the miracle might be supposed to have taken place within its district (χώρα)." SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 139 ff.: there is no certainty about the location. Cf. the surveys in KEULERS, *Matthäus*, and SMIT, *De Daemoniacis*, p. 315 ff. BISHOP, *Jesus of Palestine*, p. 134 ff.: "There is but one spot on the eastern side of the lake which meets the requirements of the story—Kersa, just south of Wadi-as-Samak. In Kersa there are caves; and one old Arabic version says the herd leapt into a cave in the stampede—inpetu abiit grex in rupim excavatam." BISHOP relates a remarkable event, communicated by an officer of the Palestine Police. It took place "in the Jordan Valley in 1943, not far from the site of Gadara. A bush fire caused a stampede of wild boar. The site of Gadara is Umm Qais." DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 69, note 1: "Vielleicht erklärt sich die textkritische und topographische Frage, ob ursprünglich vom Land der Gerasener, Gadarener oder Gergesener die Rede war, am einfachsten so, dass die Geschichte zunächst ohne Ortsangabe umlief, dann—ganz allgemein und etwas oberflächlich—im Gebiet des bekannten Gerasa lokalisiert wurde, ohne dass die Mk. 5. 14 erwähnte Stadt selbst Gerasa hätte sein sollen. Das Bestreben, diese Stadt zu identifizieren, führte dann zu den Korrekturen des Ortsnamens am Anfang der Geschichte." Dibelius thus seeks the solution in an originally different form of this account, which he characterizes as a "Nouvelle."

¹ ALLEN, *St. Matthew*. Cf. GODET, *Lukas*, who states that, among other persons, Holtzmann also holds this view.

² GODET, *Lukas*. Godet believes that of the two sick men one "played only an insignificant role in the whole scene." Unfortunately Godet forgets to tell us how that came about. NEANDER, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 321, note 1: "Dass in Matthäus zwei Dämonischen vorkommen ist wahrscheinlich nur durch die mehrfache Zahl, in welcher derselbe redet, veranlasst worden." Cf. SMIT, *De Daemoniacis*, p. 331 ff.

³ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 96. . . . BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 343 ff. There is no mythical motif present here, as Rendel Harris thinks: "Vielmehr liegt hier ein durchaus volkstümliches Motif der Erzählungsweise vor, beruhend wohl auf dem Bedürfnis der

bring us no further; when all is said and done, the accounts differ from one another.

(c) In the conversation between Jesus and the demons a number of discrepancies occur. Matthew says nothing about the "legion," whilst he is the only one to speak of torment "before the time."

(d) In Mark the demons beseech Jesus not to send them "away out of the country," whilst in Luke this reads "into the deep."

Differences enough, then. But in one respect the Synoptists agree, viz. that the unfortunate sufferer was in a serious state of lunacy. According to the Talmud there were four characteristics of madness: when someone walked abroad at night, spent the night on a grave, tore his clothes or destroyed what he was given.¹ We see from Mark what the usual way was to protect oneself against a dangerous lunatic, viz. by binding him with chains, but here it was in vain.² According to Mark and Luke the action proceeded from Jesus. For after Jesus had said: "Come out of the man, thou unclean spirit," Mk. 5 : 8, cf. Lk. 8 : 29, the demoniac fell down before Jesus — this falling down is regarded as a tactical move by the demon — and still tried to adjure Jesus.³

There is no reason to interpret Mk. 5 : 8 as an insertion.⁴ The adjuration that the demoniac utters is violent and fierce: "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God? I adjure thee by God, that thou torment me not," Mk. 5 : 7, cf. Lk. 8 : 28. EITREM thinks it inconceivable that the man would have

Anschauung, bzw. der Symmetrie" (p. 343). Bultmann gives all kinds of examples of pairs in literature and art. The originally one figure becomes in a following phase two figures, as also happened in Mt. 8 : 28 ff. and Mt. 20 : 29 ff. Compare Mk. 16 : 5, one angel, with Lk. 24 : 4, two angels. In the "Ergänzungsheft," p. 48, BULTMANN states the opinion of U. Holzmeister, *Biblica* 7 (1926), pp. 170-182, and P. Ketter, *Biblica* 15 (1934), p. 411. These scholars believe that in Mt. there is no question of "Weiterbildung der Tradition," but: "es liege in den Zahlenangaben der entsprechenden Stellen bei Mk und Lk der antike 'sensus praecisivus' vor, nach welchem die Heilung eines Zweiten nicht ausgeschlossen sei."

¹ Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 491.

² KORY, *Die Behandlung der Alten u. Kranken b.d. Naturvölkern*, refers to all kinds of means used by primitive peoples to treat the mentally ill and to protect themselves against their wrath.

³ Cf. HAUCK, *Markus*; SCHNIEWIND, *Das NTD*, I, 1. . . . According to HELD, *Mt. als Interpret der Wundersgesch.* (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 162 ff.) the strict limitation that Mt. introduced into the account is intended as a means for Christological interpretation; Mt. draws attention to the adjuring cry of the possessed, Mt. 8 : 29. The theme is the downfall of the demons.

⁴ HAUCK, *Markus*. Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*.

addressed himself to Jesus at once with so strong an adjuration, and suggests the following reconstruction of the dialogue:

Demon: What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the most high God?

Jesus: What is thy name?

Demon: My name is Legion.

Jesus: Come out of the man, Legion.

Demon: I adjure thee by God, that thou torment us not and send us not away out of the country.¹

We cannot but be struck at once by the fact that the man knows the name of Jesus. How does he know this? Was he a Jew? GREYDANUS believes that he was;² VAN LEEUWEN does not.³

In some way or the other the man must have known that it was Jesus who addressed him. As the fame of Jesus' miraculous power was widespread, it is not impossible that the demoniac's contemporaries had mentioned the name of Jesus to him on some occasion or the other. However, this must remain a supposition.⁴

The name "The most high God" was a current Jewish expression,⁵ and also occurred outside Israel.⁶ The adjuration "by God" has, however, a strange ring in the mouth of a demoniac. The man "employs the strongest adjuration that there is. He invokes God to protect him. But the adjuration is without effect, for Jesus is the Son of the highest God."⁷ The demoniac begs not to be tormented.

¹ EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

Demon: Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ, υἱὲ τοῦ ὑψίστου θεοῦ;

Jesus: Τί ὀνομά σοι;

Demon: Λεγιὼν ὀνομά μοι.

Jesus: Ἐξέλθε, Λεγιὼν, ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Demon: Ἐξορκίζω σε τὸν Θεόν, μὴ με βασανίσῃς μηδὲ ἡμᾶς ἀποστείλῃς ἔξω τῆς χώρας.

² GREYDANUS, Lukas.

³ VAN LEEUWEN, Markus.

⁴ NEANDER, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 321, tells how the demoniac notices the landing. "Er hört, dass es Jesus sei, von dessen Person und Wirksamkeit er schon vieles vernommen haben musste, denn der Ruf war von dem westlichen Ufer nach dem östlichen hinübergedrungen." PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 473: "Er muss von einigen der Begleiter gehört haben, dass und welcher unter den Gelandeten 'Jesus der Messias'—sey." This statement aroused the reflex, according to PAULUS.

⁵ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*. Cf. DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 162 f.

⁶ Cf. Ac. 16 : 17.

⁷ SCHNEIDER, *TWNT*, V, p. 464 . . . OBBINK, *De magische betekenis van de*

The word "torment" need not refer to eternal torment, an eternal punishment in Hades, as SCHNEIDER thinks it does.¹ Various exegeses, such as GOULD, VAN LEEUWEN, SCHNIEWIND and RIDDERBOS, are of the opinion that this passage refers to condemnation to hell.² BORNHÄUSER seems to know exactly what the demon thought. The principal or chief demon, the one who spoke to Jesus, saw that Jesus was not yet acting as the Messiah, but was as yet only the prophet-Messiah, so that it would still be some time before all evil spirits would be condemned to the pit. "Consequently they did not want to be banished from the earth before that time."³ Nothing stands in the way of interpreting Mark and Luke as referring to the fear of the demons, i.e. to the crisis which the encounter with Jesus caused in the mind of the sick person: in Matthew, however, the interpolation of "before the time" introduces a difficulty. Within the framework of Jewish demonology this is associated with the supposition that the demons would meet their doom in the days of the Messiah.⁴ If the man was a Jew, his utterance could be considered against this background. In all probability he was a pagan, and in that case "before the time" can be interpreted as an expression

naam inzonderheid in het oude Egypte, remarks that the demon tries to render Jesus' conjuration powerless by naming His name beforehand. "Conversely, the first thing that Jesus asks him is what his name is, for he cannot expel the demon until he knows his name." As regards the form, this corresponds to what we also encounter elsewhere (p. 77).

¹ SCHNEIDER, TWNT, V, p. 463, note 7, with reference to the "before the time" of Mt. 8 : 29. "Der Dämon bittet, ihn nicht sogleich der ewigen Strafe auszuliefern." In TWNT, I, p. 561, Schneider only says that the possessed experienced the encounter with Jesus as: "ein sie quälendes Ereignis."

² VAN LEEUWEN, Markus. "The torment that he fears perhaps refers to being sent to hell." RIDDERBOS, *De komst van het Koninkrijk*. Here this can mean "nothing less than the eternal torments of hell," p. 108.

³ BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 80 ff.

⁴ Enoch 55 : 4; Assumption of Moses 10 : 11; Testament of Levi, cap. 18; Testament of Zebulon, cap. 9; cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1, p. 527. In the *Acta Thom.* cap. 45, a demon asks the apostle: "Why do you wish to ruin us, while our time has not yet come? Why do you wish to strip us of our power? For up to this moment we had hope and time remaining." . . . The opinion that the demons regarded the pagan area as their own domain does not offer a solution. . . . CULLMANN, *Christus u. die Zeit*, p. 62, remarks with reference to Mt. 8 : 29: "Die Besessenen merken also selbst, dass hier schon πρὸ καιροῦ eine Entscheidung fällt, deren Auswirkung dem Reich Satans erst in der Zukunft noch bevorsteht." SCHLIER, *op. cit.*, p. 39 f., argues that "before our time" refers to the "Eschaton" that has come in Christ. Cf. p. 45: "Bist du gekommen, uns vor der Zeit zu quälen? Von dieser Angst sind sie aber wesentlich erfüllt, seitdem 'die Zeit', nämlich des Gerichtes, über sie mit Kreuz und Auferstehung Jesu Christi gekommen ist."

of sentiments of doom, of a fear rooted in popular beliefs of finding no peace after death.

CALVIN says that the rejected never consider the time ripe for them to undergo their punishment; they like to put it off from day to day.¹ At the same time it must be considered whether this verse has not perhaps been edited.

Now Jesus asks the demoniac for his name — for surrendering one's name means surrendering oneself — but he does not give his surname; instead the "other" answers through the victim: "My name is legion: for we are many."² The use of the word legion — in the days of the Roman Empire a legion consisted of 6000 foot-soldiers, 120 horsemen and technical personnel³ — proves that the Roman occupation was a heavy burden. The occupied territories had made the word legion a part of their ordinary vocabulary.⁴ The word legion occurs among the rabbis in both the singular and the plural form. However, it is obvious to think of the plural form here: the man was possessed by many demons who tormented him as one combined force.⁵ Hence the confusion between singular and plural in the text. Was the man trying, by naming this powerful name, to adjure Jesus again and fill Him with fear? An interesting

¹ CALVIN, Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas, re Mt. 8 : 29: "Quid ergo sibi vult particula, Ante tempus? nempe quia reprobis poenae luendae tempus nunquam maturum est. libenter enim diem ex die traherent." ROHDE, *Psyche*, II, p. 411 ff. (Anhang zu S. 83), refers to the misery of those who have died before their "allotted" time. They accompany Hecate on her mysterious journeys; their souls wander restlessly . . . In our opinion the cry of the Gadarene demoniac can best be understood in the light of such a group of ideas. He feared an untimely death, as a result of which a dreadful fate would await him.

² Mk. 5 : 9, λεγιὼν ὀνομά μοι; Lk. 8 : 30, only λεγιὼν . . .! As regards the asking after the name, LANGTON, op. cit., p. 157, remarks: "The most probable explanation is that we have here an accommodation on the part of our Lord to the popular belief that in order to gain control over a demon (or a god) it is necessary to know his name."

³ PREISKER, TWNT, IV, p. 68.

⁴ PREISKER, TWNT, IV, p. 68.

⁵ Cf. Lk. 8 : 2; 11 : 26. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 9. For the multiplicity of the demons see BLAU, op. cit., p. 10 ff.; EITREM, op. cit., p. 56; CALVIN, Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas, comments with reference to Mk. 5 : 9 that here the general error is refuted which the Jews and the Christians adopted from the pagans, viz. that every man has his own separate devil (Simul refellitur vulgaris ille error quem Judaei et Christiani a profanis hominibus mutuati sunt: quod scilicet singulis hominibus infesti sint singuli daemones). SCHLIER, op. cit., p. 17 f., points out that the demon in the sense of the N.T. is: "ein Exemplar des Dämonischen." Consequently the one δαίμόνιον in the Gadarene demoniac can say that he is "legion." "Einer ist hier viele und umgekehrt."

case is mentioned by OESTERREICH. He quotes from a letter by a French missionary telling how the healing of a number of demoniacs was performed. The letter includes the following passage: "There is a poor demoniac who, amidst a thousand convulsions, shouts at the top of his voice: 'Why do you preach the true religion? I cannot tolerate your robbing me of my pupils.' 'What is your name?' the catechist asked him. After some hesitation he replied: 'I am Lucifer's envoy' 'How many of you are there?' 'There are twenty-two.' Holy water and the sign of the cross healed this demoniac."¹ The use of such strong names may be regarded both as boasting and bragging and as a means of inspiring fear and respect.

The demoniac then beseeches Jesus not to send them "away out of the country." Luke's version is "into the deep." This is not the same: Mark means a distant country,² whilst Luke has Hades in mind.³ This idea of sending demons away also occurs elsewhere. WEINREICH makes a distinction between sending away in general, *apompē*, in which it is immaterial where the cursed ones and the spirits go to, and banishment to a certain place, *epompē*. The altruistic form of *epompē* is to send the spirits to a place where they cannot harm men again: the desert, uninhabited mountains, the sea, the ends of the world, into animals.⁴ The exact meaning cannot be derived from our text.⁵ The demons beg Jesus to be allowed to enter into a large herd of swine, about two thousand in number, feeding on a mountain. This points to our being in a pagan environment, since the pig was an unclean animal to the Israelites, see Lev. 11 : 7. According to GALLING the ban on eating pork is tied up with the fact that the greater part of game that was hunted was not sacrificial meat,⁶ whilst PEDERSEN points to the use of the pig in strange cults.⁷ The three Evangelists agree with each other in their account

¹ OESTERREICH, *op. cit.*, p. 214.

² Cf. Tobit 8 : 3. A demon takes flight when he smells the heart and the liver of a fish burning. He flees to far-off parts of Egypt, where he is bound by an angel.

³ DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 52 . . . J. JEREMIAS, *TWNT*, I, p. 9, points to the meaning of ἄβυσσος as underworld: (a) prison of the disobedient spirits (Lk. 8 : 31; Ac. 9 : 1, 2, 11; 11 : 7; 17 : 8; 20 : 1, 3); (b) the realm of the dead (Ro. 10 : 7).

⁴ WEINREICH, *Gebet u. Wunder*, p. 172 ff.

⁵ BAUERNFEIND, *op. cit.*, p. 38 f.

⁶ GALLING, *Bibl. Reallexikon*, col. 531, cf. col. 286. CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 113.

⁷ PEDERSEN, *Israel*, I-II, p. 482. See also FRAZER, *The Golden Bough*, V, 2, p. 23 f. Frazer describes the attitude of the Jews towards the pig as ambiguous;

that the whole herd rushed down the mountainside into the lake and drowned. This event as such offers no difficulties. Terrified by the raving demoniac, the swine went mad. "Panic is also possible in the animal kingdom, where the self-preservation urge is likewise to be found. There are strange examples known of panic among domestic animals having no less regrettable consequences than in human society. Whole herds of domestic animals have met their death in water as the result of panic."¹

they could neither eat it nor kill it. "We must conclude that, originally at least, the pig was revered rather than abhorred by the Israelites." Frazer considers this view to be confirmed by Isa. 65 : 4; 66 : 3, 17. "And in general it may be said that all so-called unclean animals were originally sacred; the reason for not eating them was that they were divine." BODENHEIMER, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands*, p. 216 f., contests this theory of Frazer's. ZAMBACO, *La Lèpre*, gives a natural explanation. Moses forbade the use of pork: "pour purifier le sang cacochyme de son troupeau" (p. 177). See also BETZ, *Lukian von Samosata und das N.T.*, p. 37 f.

¹ Bechterew, *ZNTW*, XV, 45, quoted by FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 50. F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 132, thinks that we may assume "ohne allen Rationalismus" that Jesus' words to the demoniac: "einen letzten wilden Ausbruch des Übels vor der Heilung hervorrief," which aroused panic among the swine. Cf. TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.*, p. 41. MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 57. The healing process passed through a crisis. "This would seem a sufficient explanation of the stampede of the swine." Corresponding opinions: MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 360; GOODSPEED, *A Life of Jesus*, p. 92; HUNTER, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, p. 58; TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 101. BULTMANN, *Ergänzungsheft* (b. *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*), p. 31, states the opinion of W. L. Knox, *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels I* (1953), p. 39. Knox believes that: "ein ursprünglich heidnischer ätiologischer Mythos" is the basis of the story: "der erklärt, dass als Reinigungsopfer Schweine (oder andere Opfer) von einem Felsen in einen See oder Fluss gestürzt wurden." Bultmann considers this: "Nicht gerade wahrscheinlich!" PLUMMER, *St. Luke*: "It is futile to ask whether each animal was possessed. If some of them were set in motion, the rest would follow mechanically." BERTRAM, *TWNT*, V, p. 470: "Sie werden von dämonischen Schrecken ergriffen und durch ihre eigene Masse unwiderstehlich dahingetrieben." Bertram recalls the behaviour of the masses in Ac. 7 : 57; 19 : 29 . . . Another view is that of NEANDER, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 323, note 1. He rejects the view that the demoniac entered into a frenzy. "Nur wenn er selbst ruhig stehen blieb, er die Herde aber von einer unsichtbaren Gewalt fortgetrieben sah, konnte in ihm der Gedanke Raum gewinnen, die bösen Geister hätten ihn verlassen und seien auf die Schweine übergegangen. Dafür spricht die Analogie der Zeitvorstellungen." Neander refers to Flavii Josephus, *Ant.*, VIII, 1, the story of the exorcist who, to demonstrate all the more clearly the force of his conjurations, fills a pitcher with water and commands the evil spirit to knock it over, so as to show by that sign that he had left the demoniac . . . An example that offers no proof if the stories are compared closely . . . As regards the "steep place" where the swine were killed, KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 284, believes that: "wenn Gerasa = el-Kursi ist, empfiehlt sich der Abhang bei mōka' 'edlo, 2 km südlich von der Ortschaft, 30-40 m vom See entfernt."

If it is assumed that the swine were in fact possessed by the demons,¹ it may even be asked who are meant by: "and were choked in the sea." Who were choked, the swine or the demons? BORNHÄUSER has pointed out that pigs are excellent swimmers and that these animals were in any case acquainted with the Sea of Galilee. He even asks us to consider "whether the incident did not in fact conclude with the dying demons having to leave the swine, and the latter swimming back to land well content, after a beneficial bathe."² He thus believes that the demons, robbed of their vital element, the air, die in the water, cf. Jude 6, which then means the first death to the Jews.³ It takes a vivid imagination indeed to picture the way in which demons dying in the water leave a herd of swimming pigs and are then swallowed up by the sea!

A further difficulty is presented by the question of why Jesus granted the demons' request. Did the demons want to cause the inhabitants of that district to curse God as a result of the loss of the swine, and did Jesus permit this to test the Gadarenes, as CALVIN believes?⁴ Or did Jesus by this trial wish to test the Gadarenes on whether they would rate the boon conferred on two of their fellows higher than the loss of the herd?⁵

GREYDANUS wonders whether the owners of the swine were perhaps Jews "who were now hard hit in their guilty doings."⁶ In that case this would at the same time be a punitive miracle. PLUMMER looks elsewhere for the solution: he supposes that Jesus permitted the destruction of the herd, perhaps for the purpose of demonstrating

¹ GREYDANUS, Lukas. "Before entering into swine, too, the devils had first to have the Lord's permission . . . For these swine this entering of devils into them was something very unusual, which doubtless terrified and alarmed them."

² BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 83.

³ BORNHÄUSER, *op. cit.*, p. 82. BAUERNFEIND, *Die Worte der Dämonen*, p. 38, wonders whether the demons really entered the lake. "Sollte es nicht selbstverständlich sein, dass sie ihre Opfer lieber einen Augenblick vorher verliessen?", or were they bound? BAUERNFEIND sees many problems here.

⁴ CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mt. 8 : 31: "Christus vero annuens, non eorum vota exaudit, sed hac occasione probare vult quales sint Gadareni." Calvin does not consider this interpretation definite; we must "respectfully admire this concealed judgment of God" (*Caeterum ut nulla nobis constet certa ratio, occultum tamen Dei iudicium reverenter suspicere, et pia humilitate adorare convenit*).

⁵ According to SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 30, this statement originates from J. J. Hess and its moral has been adopted by a number of theologians. TRENCH, *Notes on the Miracles*, p. 174: "... it is the taking away of the meaner thing, for the purpose of making receptive of the higher."

⁶ GREYDANUS, Lukas.

the seriousness of the disease to the disciples, so that the healing would increase their faith.¹

Then there is the possibility of cunning intent on the part of the demons. Jesus had agreed to their entering the herd, and so He is the one really responsible for the loss. "They act not as deceived devils, but as deceiving devils," says BAUERNFEIND.² That is to say, at the very last minute they get Jesus into great trouble with the local inhabitants. DEHN perceives the reason for the slyness in the thoughts of the demons: "that Jesus, as a Jew, would hardly have anything against the despised, unclean swine becoming the home of the demons."³ These are all guesses, spotlighting now the one, and then the other party to the scene, and containing a search for a pedagogic motive in many cases. BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL rightly places in the centre the two persons directly concerned in the healing, viz. the patient and the healer. Jesus does not seem to worry in the slightest about the loss of the swine: "not because, as a law-abiding Israelite, he regarded them as 'filthy lucre,' but because at the moment of a 'liberation' everything must serve and must be available."⁴ When the herd has disappeared into the lake and the

¹ PLUMMER, *St. Luke* . . . VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 403, thinks that Jesus, compelled by the situation, only allowed the herd of swine to be involved to distract the *idée fixe* of the demoniac. The result was just as unexpected as it was unpleasant for Jesus, hence his hasty departure, Lk. 8 : 37.

² BAUERNFEIND, *op. cit.*, p. 43. . . . See on the other hand BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 224, on the theme "vom betrogenen Teufel." DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 85 f., recalls the link between the pig and Hades, so that this can be seen as a trip to Hades. Like Bultmann, Dibelius rejects Bauernfeind's view (p. 86). The demons themselves do not deceive, but they are deceived.

³ DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*.

⁴ BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, *Markus*. Cf. PLUMMER, *St. Luke*: "Brutes and private property may be sacrificed, where the sanity and lives of persons are concerned." TRENCH, *Notes on the Miracles*, p. 173. KEULERS, *Mattheüs*, says that it was the evil spirits that did the damage. "One might just as well ask how God can do damage by a hail-storm or by lightning." PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 475, rightly comments: "Jesus oder den Geheilten des Schadens anzuklagen, war nach den Begriffen derer, die ihn erlitten, unmöglich. Nach diesen hatten alles die Dämonen gethan. Dies glaubten die Besitzer, wir mögen sie als Juden oder als Heiden denken." Cf. the detailed explanation in SMIT. *De Daemoniacis*, p. 362 ff. Good for the man meant more than evil for the herd. . . . See the criticism which RIDDERBOS, *op. cit.*, p. 110 f., makes of the various explanations. Ridderbos' own view, viz. that Jesus, by granting permission to the demons to enter the swine, returns to them their freedom to continue their work of destruction, offers no new perspectives.

swineherds have reported the loss to the owners, people come from all directions to the scene of the happening, where they find Jesus and the demoniac, now dressed and of sound mind again. With emphasis Mark says "him that. . . had the legion." A lively discussion develops and the result is that they urge Jesus to leave their area; they are afraid. BORNHÄUSER says that it is not correct to think that they wanted rid of Jesus on account of the loss of the swine, no, they were afraid of HIM!¹ The one was doubtless connected with the other. The fact that "the whole multitude of the country of the Gadarenes," Lk. 8 : 37, besought Jesus to leave their area, together with the entreaties of the healed man to be permitted to stay with Jesus, indicates that we must envisage a pagan environment² and not the numerous Jewish population in that region, for whom Jesus would have been willing to leave the healed man behind as a preacher, as GREYDANUS thinks.³ A striking statement is that Jesus instructs this man to tell them "how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee" (note the name "the Lord," i.e. God), whilst He imposes silence in other cases.

VAN LEEUWEN says that Jesus does this since erroneous Messianic expectations or political explosions will not be aroused in this pagan country,⁴ whilst KLAUSNER thinks that Jesus is not afraid here of the investigations of the Pharisees or of an undesirable growth in the numbers of his followers.⁵ It is incorrect to think that the healed man had to tell of his healing only to "thine own house" and "thy friends" — i.e. to assume a certain secrecy all the same — since Jesus did not after all impose silence.

The question of what disease the victim was suffering from cannot be answered precisely. KLAUSNER thinks that it was delirium tremens.⁶ WORCESTER asserts that the man "is plainly the victim of some type of mania."⁷ In a broad definition FENNER characterizes the symptoms as those of a "hysterical psychosis, which represents a

¹ BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 83. Cf. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 86: "der Wundermann, nicht der Schadenstifter ist es, den man aus dem Lande hinauswünscht, und Furcht, nicht Empörung, bewegt die Gemüter."

² VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*. PLUMMER, *St. Luke*.

³ GREYDANUS, *Lukas*. Greydanus thinks that Jesus probably would not have acted in this way towards pagans, cf. Mt. 10 : 5; 15 : 24, 26.

⁴ VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*.

⁵ KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

⁶ KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 296.

⁷ WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, *Religion and Medicine*, p. 360. VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 402: the man was a monomaniac.

mixture of manic and melancholic-depressive states in paranoid form.”¹ All that can be derived from the text is that the man suffered from a dangerous lunacy, for which experts might perhaps be able with circumspection to give some further designations.

Understandably, many an ingenious meaning has been read into this account, which lies heavily on the exegete's stomach. We may recall the strange attempt by SCHMIEDEL to see in the demoniac nobody less than Paul, whose four stages of public activity, viz. persecution of the Christians, inner struggle, conversion and mission to the heathens, can be pointed to “with certainty.” He is of the opinion that the symbolic and allegorical interpretation “has full rights” in certain places in the Synoptists.² Another version is that the Gadarene demoniac is the image of pagan man, who is possessed by a legion of false gods, but to whom full reason is restored by the religion of Jesus.³

The story of this demoniac is several times compared with three miracle stories: the account of Khonsu in Egypt,⁴ the story of the encounter between Rabbi Hanina ben Dosa and the female demon

¹ FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 50. SMIT, *De Daemoniacis*, p. 352, does not deny that the man may have suffered from paranoia, melancholia, hypochondria or catatonia. But he says that at the same time this man was possessed by a demon. TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 101: “. . . Jesus was met by ‘a man with an unclean spirit’ or, as we should say today, a man afflicted with the tortures of a divided personality.”

² SCHMIEDEL, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 114 ff. SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 141, note 2, rightly says that Schmiedel's view is not open to discussion.

³ W. B. SMITH, *Ecce Deus*, p. 120. According to Jensen, *Gilgamesch-epos*, I, 845, the 2000 Gadarene swine represent mankind, who are to drown; see CLEMEN, *Religionsgesch. Erklär. des N.T.*, p. 214.

⁴ MASPERO, *Les contes populaires de l'Égypte ancienne*, p. 183 f., recounts in detail the report of the possession of a king's daughter on a pillar discovered by Champollion in the temple of Khonsu, in Thebes. Khonsu in Thebes, “*dieu de bon conseil*,” is requested to have Khonsu “*qui règle les destinées*” brought to Bakhtan. (The images of the god were double: there is an exalted Khonsu and an active Khonsu, who concerns himself with men.) Khonsu “*qui règle les destinées*” is transported on a large ship to Bakhtan. “*Voici, dès que ce Dieu fut allé au lieu où était Bintashît et qu'il eut fait les passes magiques à la fille du prince de Bakhtan, elle se trouva bien sur-le-champ et le revenant qui était avec elle dit en présence de Khonsou, qui règle les destinées en Thèbes ‘Viens en paix, dieu grand qui chasses les étrangers, Bakhtan est ta ville, ses gens sont tes esclaves et moi-même je suis ton esclave. Je m'en irai donc au lieu d'où je suis venu, afin de donner à ton cœur satisfaction au sujet de l'affaire qui t'amène, mais ordonne Ta Majesté qu'on célèbre un jour de fête pour moi et pour le prince de Bakhtan’.*” During this festival: “*le revenant s'en alla en paix au lieu qu'il lui plut, selon l'ordre de Khonsou qui règle les destinées en Thèbes.*”

Igrat in the Talmud,¹ and the story of the healing of a possessed lad by Apollonius of Tyana.²

REITZENSTEIN points to the similarity between the story of Khonsu and the Gospels: the demon as a producer of disease, the special knowledge of the demon — he at once addresses the deity by name — the concession of the demon and the condition that he makes. REITZENSTEIN accounts for this similarity not by literature, “but by Jewish magical beliefs, which were under a particularly strong influence from Egypt.” He therefore wishes to draw attention to this story as an answer to the question of how the demons knew Jesus as the Messiah, and considers it important in this respect, since the original picture is most purely preserved here.³

In the rabbinical account of Ḥanina ben Dosa we find related

¹ Pesahim 112b/113a: “‘And do not go out alone at night’ for it was taught: One should not go out alone at night, i.e., on the nights of neither Wednesday nor Sabbaths, because Igrath the daughter of Mahalath ¹⁾, she and 180000 destroying angels go forth, and each has permission to wreak destruction independently. Originally they were about all day. On one occasion she met R. Ḥanina b. Dosa (and) said to him, ‘Had they not made an announcement concerning you in Heaven, “Take heed of Ḥanina and his learning,” I would have put you in danger.’ ‘If I am of account in Heaven’ replied he, ‘I order you never to pass through settled regions.’ ‘I beg you,’ she pleaded, ‘leave me a little room?’ So he left her the nights of Sabbaths and the nights of Wednesdays.” (Ed. Epstein: transl. H. Freedman).

² VITA APOLL., IV, 20. Apollonius was once mocked by a lad. Apollonius then said that the insult did not come forth from the boy, but originated from a demon who lived in him without his knowledge. But many thought that the lad was over-bold. The story then goes on (in the translation of C. P. Eells): “In interrupting Apollonius he seemed to be acting with his usual freakishness; but when Apollonius looked steadfastly at him the demon uttered loud shrieks of fear and wrath, like those who are harrassed or tortured, and it offered to swear that it would leave the lad, and never enter any human being again. Apollonius commanded it, as a master would command a slave, who is cunning, clever, impudent and notorious for other like faults; and he wrathfully ordered it to come forth from the lad in such a way that it could be known; whereupon the demon cried out: ‘I will throw down that statue,’ indicating one of the statues near the palace portico where this was occurring. The statue first swayed on its base and then fell; and who could describe the shout which went up over it, and the applause of the wondering crowd? The lad rubbed his eyes as if waking from sleep, and looked up at the sunlight, appearing overcome with shyness at finding every one staring at him. He no longer had that wanton or disordered look, and he reverted to his natural disposition, as if he had swallowed a medicine. Discarding his gauzy, effeminate garments, and all his other extravagances, he came to love simplicity and a plain cloak, and modeled himself entirely on the ways of Apollonius.”

³ REITZENSTEIN, *Hellen. Wundererzählungen*, p. 124.

¹⁾ The queen of demons.

features. Here too we find a special knowledge by the female demon; a conversation takes place between the rabbi and Igrat; we encounter a multitude of demons. FIEBIG refers to Mk. 5 : 9, 13, whilst time and place are also available for the demon.¹

In the account of the healing of the possessed lad by Apollonius we are struck by the boy's rage; the conversation and the destruction of the statue; and by the fact that, having calmed down, he dresses himself properly and models himself on Apollonius. An obvious question is whether there was perhaps a literary "pattern" for describing such violent scenes. PERELS believes that the short, pregnant dialogue form of the miracles was the original one and that the detailed descriptions are to a great extent due to the Hellenistic environment.² To him the stories handed down to us are the product of association and blending of historical happening and stylizing tradition.³

Indisputably, the personal views of the exegete will continue to be of great importance in assessing an account such as this, with its so strange and complex content and form. After a thorough analysis, DIBELIUS concludes that it is a story which is full of profane motives and which in the final analysis is doubtless of profane (Jewish) origin.⁴ KÖHLER, on the other hand, wonders what objections there are to this account in an objective critical respect. "It may be historical, and therefore I believe that it ought to be taken as historical. For I would have to have reasons for not doing so, and I have no such reasons, nor do I find them in Dibelius and Bultmann."⁵

¹ FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 26. PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 80, points to the affinity in the structure of the accounts, especially the form, but also sees an obvious difference. "Der Unterschied vom Neuen Testament liegt wieder in der Unterordnung der Geschichte unter eine Lehre: die Regel, man solle in den Mittwochs- und Sabbatnächten nicht allein ausgehen; ausserdem in dem zauberhaften Charakter: die Dämonin ist nicht an einen Menschen gebunden, sondern erscheint persönlich."

² PERELS, *op. cit.*, p. 89. Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, p. 14 ff.

³ PERELS, *op. cit.*, p. 90. In this matter Perels adopts a different attitude from that of M. Dibelius . . . STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 41, already spoke of a "Zusammentreffen verschiedener Zeitvorstellungen und Interessen," referring to the example of Eleazar in Flavius Josephus and the account already mentioned of the healing of a lad by Apollonius of Tyana.

⁴ DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 84 ff.

⁵ KÖHLER, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des N.T.*, p. 36. SCHNIEWIND, *Das NTD*, I, 1, remarks with reference to Jesus' conversation with the spirits and the end of the swine: "Hier wird irgend eine Trübung der Überlieferung vorliegen." DODD, *History and the Gospel*, p. 97, says that in Mk. 5 : 1-20 a story is developed "in a way which makes it very like popular stories of wonder-

Indeed, if too ingenious an attempt is made to separate the forms and colours of this story and to verify their origin, there is the danger that the miracle stories of the New Testament will end up in the pagan workshop for the fabrication of wonders and magic. What the Evangelists are trying to tell us here is that the victory of Jesus Christ over evil forces, the healing of a dangerous lunatic, is a reality, in which the liberating force of the Kingdom of God is manifest.

4. *The "lunatic" boy*

The account of the healing of the "lunatic" boy, Mt 17 : 14-21, Mk. 9 : 14-29, Lk. 9 : 37-43, appears in the same order in each of the Synoptists, viz. between the transfiguration on the mountain and the second prediction of His death by Jesus. The differences between the three stories are not major ones. Mark, who has far and away the most detailed account, refers to the dispute between the scribes and the disciples (9 : 14).¹ The symptoms are differently described: Matthew calls the boy "lunatic," Mark speaks of a dumb spirit, and Luke refers to a spirit that takes the boy. Only in Mark does the conversation between Jesus and the boy's father occur. Matthew and Mark conclude their account with the conversation that Jesus has with His disciples, but this is absent from Luke.² The story has had its fixed place in tradition, for otherwise, says SCHMIDT, Mark would not have placed it here, since in the direct sense it has nothing to do with either the transfiguration on the mountain or the Passion of Christ.³ When Jesus' three intimates, Peter, James and

workers current in the Hellenistic world, and in its present form it probably lies very far from the central line of tradition; but it nevertheless preserves an element which is deeply embedded in the whole tradition of the words and works of Jesus."

¹ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, points to the view that the scribes are secondary; they are not necessary to the disputation and Jesus does not concern Himself with them . . . BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 225, includes the account among the "Wundergeschichten;" according to DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 68, it is a "Novelle." The greatly abridged account given by Matthew, according to HELD, *Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch.* (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 177 ff.), can best be understood on the basis of "das Thema der Jüngerschaft." The final conversation forms the real purpose of the pericope.

² PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 43 f., distinguishes in Mt., Mk. and Lk. different parts of the accounts.

³ SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 227: "Daraus wird man schliessen müssen, dass Markus hier in der Anordnung der Geschichten durch die Überlieferung gebunden ist." According to SCHMIDT this story is based on

John, came down from the mountain with Jesus — this was probably Mount Hermon, not Mount Tabor — they saw (HAUCK rightly asks whether this “seeing” relates to a recollection of Peter’s¹) a great multitude and arguing scribes. It is not said where this multitude came from. Marks says that the multitude were “greatly amazed” when they saw Jesus (9 : 15). Attempts have been made to associate this amazement with the transfiguration, it being argued that the glory of transfiguration was still visible on the countenance of Jesus.² However, an obvious answer would be that the multitude were seized with surprise because Jesus appeared at a critical moment: there was a dispute about His power — it is probable that the disciples, the scribes and some of the bystanders were all taking part in this dispute — and the disciples were powerless. And then, all at once, there was Jesus! Mark describes the meeting in vivid fashion: they ran to Him and greeted Him.³ Possibly the disciples had tried in various ways to heal the sick boy, but in vain. Now if this account is regarded as a story in which the contrast between the majesty and might of the divine miracle-worker and the impotence of His servants is demonstrated, the question of the historicity of the data at once comes to the fore.⁴ For if, as DIBELIUS argues, in these short accounts (Novellen) the heart of the matter lies in the miracle, which men find “impossible,” and the miracle therefore serves the sole purpose here

“wirkliche Erinnerung und Geschichte,” which knew that it was associated with this period.

¹ HAUCK, Markus . . . As regards the mountain see among others DALMAN, Orte u. Wege, p. 202 ff., 216, 219; KLAUSNER, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 303; KOPP, Die heiligen Stätten der Ev., p. 300 ff.

² Cf. Ex. 34 : 29. DEHN, Der Gottessohn: “Der Glanz der himmlischen Verwandlung liegt noch auf dem Gottessohn.” GOULD, St. Mark, says that the amazement is caused either by the afterglow of the transfiguration or by the well-timed arrival of Jesus. DIBELIUS, Die Formgeschichte, p. 78: “Das Staunen gilt nicht einem Abglanz der Verklärung, denn davon ist nichts gesagt.” VAN LEEUWEN, Markus, does not think of an afterglow either.

³ DIBELIUS, op. cit., p. 77 f.: the disciples could not heal him: “nun kommt Jesus gerade zur rechten Stunde, da staunt das Volk und läuft herzu und grüsst ihn.” The amazement, according to Dibelius, is an expression of reverence for the miracle-worker.

⁴ DIBELIUS, op. cit., pp. 77 f., 91 f. We are concerned here with a miracle-worker as an epiphany. BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 225. The point of the first story is: “die Gegenüberstellung des Meisters und der Zauberlehrlinge.” Cf. KLOSTERMANN, Das Markusevangelium. HAUCK, Lukas: “Antike Epiphanie-erzählungen bieten die Parallele, dass bei Abwesenheit des Gottes dem Priester Heilungen misslingen, während das Eintreffen des Gottes die Sache alsbald in Ordnung bringt. So sind hier beim Fernesein Jesu die Jünger machtlos. Erst sein Eintreffen bewirkt die Heilung.”

of announcing the epiphany of the deity on earth,¹ it may be suspected that form and facts do not tally. But who could say for sure what is part of the technique of the miracle story formally and materially, i.e. what data and motives penetrated the Synoptic Gospels from the "world" and were incorporated in them?²

The story in no way creates the impression that only the miraculous power of Jesus is being emphasized; the subsidiary accents are too pronounced for that. First of all a strong stress falls on the impotence of the disciples. In our opinion it is not too bold to presume that during the absence of Jesus and His three intimates, a spirit of unbelief and laxity had overcome the disciples, perhaps partly as a result of conversations between them, leading to their impotence. For in the three Evangelists the statement by the father that the disciples are impotent is immediately followed by Jesus' exclamation: "O faithless generation, how long shall I be with you? How long shall I suffer you?"³

Opinions differ on who is meant by that "generation." The following have been suggested: the disciples; the father; the father and the multitude; the multitude alone; the scribes; all those present. In our opinion the account only begins to acquire relief when the pregnant exclamation by Jesus is interpreted as a personal address, and in that case only the disciples can be meant. For it was not the father, or the scribes, or the people who had failed at the decisive moment, but the disciples, who were endowed with the charism of healing, cf. Mk. 6 : 7. The prophetic pregnancy is evidenced by His addressing them as "faithless and perverse generation," cf. Deu. 32 : 5. Consequently this story may not be interpreted only as epiphany, as the appearance of the divine benefactor, but rather as a demonstration of the disaster which occurs when those from whom the power of faith may be expected are wanting in it when it is needed! The explanation in Mt. 17 : 20: "because of your unbelief," is a clear indication that Jesus meant the disciples.

With a "bring him unto me" Jesus directs the attention of all to the sick boy. The father has already made known the boy's disease.⁴ Mark and Luke refer to the attack that the boy suffered when he was

¹ DIBELIUS, *op. cit.*, p. 91.

² DIBELIUS, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

³ Mk. 9 : 19; cf. the variation: faithless and perverse generation, in Mt. 17 : 17 and Lk. 9 : 41.

⁴ Mt. 17 : 15; Mk. 9 : 18; Lk. 9 : 38, 39.

brought to Jesus.¹ Mark adds the detail that the father, in answer to a question by Jesus, gives some information on his son's illness: he has been sick since childhood and he might suffer a fatal accident some day. He concludes with the prayer: "but if thou canst do any thing, have compassion on us, and help us." The answer that Jesus gives him: "If thou canst [believe], all things are possible to him that believeth," reinforces the view that this account is meant to demonstrate the power of faith. Jesus' words: "if thou canst" — i.e. as regards your remark about my power to help your son² — "all things are possible to him that believeth" are immediately related by the father to himself: "Lord, I believe, help thou mine unbelief." KLOSTERMANN points out that one really expects the following: to the righteous miracle-worker Jesus everything is possible, since He possesses the right faith.³ In our opinion that "if thou canst" must in fact be interpreted in this sense. And then more light is cast on the harsh words to the disciples, for Jesus is not referring here to belief as a condition precedent to receiving healing, but means belief as an active force in the accomplishment of a healing! The "if thou canst do any thing" spoken by the father contains a concealed accusation against the powerlessness of the disciples, whose unbelief is again immediately referred to in Jesus' answer. Jesus does not say a single word about the father's declaration of faith (!), but commands the unclean spirit to leave the boy, which happens to the accompaniment of cries and convulsions.⁴ The story ends in Matthew and Mark with a discussion between Jesus and the disciples about their impotence. Perhaps this may be regarded as an addition,

¹ GREYDANUS, Lukas, with reference to 9 : 42: "This demon understood what was going to happen, and tried to strike the first blow and kill this boy" . . . Cf. MAES, *Fetischen of tooverbeelden uit Kongo*, p. 17, which describes how Mambo's spirit brings epilepsy. When that spirit penetrates your body, according to the Negroes, you do not feel him. Your body remains externally healthy, "but unexpectedly Mambo makes himself felt: your face darkens, your strength dwindles, and your body is hurled roughly against the ground, where you continue to lie senseless or in a fit."

² τὸ εἰ δύνη, Mk. 9 : 23. Cf. BLASS-DEBRUNNER, *Neutest. Gramm.*, Anhang, § 267. Many manuscripts have the version: τὸ εἰ δύνη πιστεῦσαι: if thou canst believe! This is also to be found in the Authorized Version.

³ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*. HAUCK, *Markus: Jesus' answer picks up the "if" of the doubt and parries it* . . . HELD, *Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch.* (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 179 f.), gives various explanations which in his opinion have their pros and cons.

⁴ Mk. 9 : 26; cf. Mt. 17 : 18 and Lk. 9 : 42, where the healing process is described briefly. For the "cry", κράζω, see GRUNDMANN, *TWNT*, III, p. 900 f.

but in any case it is related to the kernel of the account. In Matthew (17 : 20) the unbelief of the disciples is specifically mentioned as a cause; Mark merely reports Jesus' words: "This kind can come forth by nothing, but by prayer and fasting" (9 : 29). ¹ This kind, i.e. devils, in particular these very malign, evil spirits (remember the seriousness of the disease), can be expelled only by the power of prayer. The Jews regarded the recitation of the Shema, of the 3rd and the 91st psalms — the latter was even called "the song against the demons" — as a powerful agent against evil spirits. Fasting also kept demons away. ² The disciples had failed because they had not acted in prayer and faith. The account of the healing of the lunatic boy therefore forms a self-contained whole, and there is not the slightest reason to make two stories out of it, as BULTMANN does. ³ The healing of the sick boy is thus used to demonstrate not only how great Christ's power is, but also what faith could have accomplished!

As regards the illness from which the boy was suffering, we this time encounter a surprising unanimity, viz, that this is a case of epilepsy. The symptoms described — convulsions, foaming at the mouth, falling into fire and water, gnashing the teeth and going rigid — are all symptoms of an epileptic fit. EBSTEIN gives a precise analysis of this story; he compares it with analogous cases and supposes that the fits were connected with a "material substratum in the central nervous system," which the boy had perhaps had since birth. Perhaps the boy was also deaf and dumb, cf. Mk. 9 : 17. ⁴ Many theologians believe that this is a case of epilepsy. ⁵

¹ Some manuscripts add to Mk. 9 : 29 καὶ νηστείας, whilst various manuscripts add in Mt. 17 as verse 21: "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by praying and fasting." GOULD, St. Mark: καὶ νηστείας: "is an evident glosse. It is one of the things that a later ascetism imported into the spiritual teaching of Jesus." See also SMIT, op. cit., p. 501 ff. ² Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 760.

³ BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 225 f., believes that here, even before Mk., two miracle stories were linked, viz. Mk. 9 : 14-20 and 21-27. The end of the first account is perhaps hidden in 25. A precise separation is no longer possible. The purpose of the second account is the description of "die Paradoxie des ungläubigen Glaubens." PERELS, Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker, p. 98: "Mit Bultmann ist in Vers 21 ff., ein Einschub, vielleicht eine zweite Heilungsgeschichte zu sehen." HELD, Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch. (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 177): the account is: "offenbar eine Kombination von zwei Wunderberichten."

⁴ EBSTEIN, op. cit., p. 67 ff. SENG, Die Heilungen Jesu, p. 11. PREUSS, Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin, pp. 341-345, deals at length with epilepsy. The נִפֹּל is the "falling one." Preuss also counts Bileam (Nu. 24 : 4) and Saul (1 Sa. 19 : 24) among the epileptics; cf. p. 356 ff.

⁵ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 758; ALLEN, St. Matthew: "Some form of epi-

We have already said that epilepsy, the "holy disease," is one of the group of diseases to which man has devoted particular attention in every age and country because of their mysterious nature. A connection has been sought between ecstasy and epilepsy; some have even branded Jesus an epileptic.¹ It is interesting and useful to investigate the ways in which various peoples behave towards sufferers from epilepsy: the Bagirmi in the Central and Eastern Sudan kill the epileptics;² the Eastern Bantus do not kill them,³ but some Bantu tribes carefully avoid them.⁴ Some Kaffir peoples abhor them and throw them into precipices or tie them to trees to become the prey of hyenas.⁵ The Carajas in Brazil let epileptics walk around freely, but keep them under supervision.⁶ The Teleuts in North Asia believe that in epilepsy the ancestors, the shamans, state their wishes: the epileptic himself becomes a medium, or shaman.⁷ Here we thus have the link between ecstasy and epilepsy. We find in RIVERS a remarkable statement on the exorcising of the epilepsy demon on a Melanesian island. "When anyone suffers from epilepsy or other convulsive seizure which is recognized as kirengge, he and his friends consult one known to have the power of imposing the kenio kirengge. This man visits the patient and strokes him from the head downwards with four leaves called nyou, some moss, soot and scraping of wood, uttering the formula: 'Stroke away. Stroke down and away. Cease thou. Let the man live; do not return. They

leptic seizure." VAN LEEUWEN, Markus; GOULD, St. Mark; HAUCK, Markus; KEULERS, Mattheüs; HAUCK, Lukas; SCHNIEWIND, Das NTD, I, 1, BORNHÄUSER, Das Wirken des Christus, p. 139; WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, Religion and Medicine, p. 360. NEANDER, Das Leben Jesu Christi, p. 493: "epileptische Convulsionen mit einem Zustande des Stumpf- und Blödsinnes oder der Melancholie." PAULUS, Exegetisches Handbuch. SMIT, De Daemoniacis, p. 473, does see resemblances to epilepsy, but there are nevertheless differences.

¹ According to Emil Rasmussen Jesus suffered from an epileptic mental disease. See SCHWEITZER's refutation in *Die psychiatrische Beurteilung Jesu*, p. 45 f. . . . According to various scholars Paul also suffered from epilepsy, see EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 75; see the survey in FENNER, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-40. SCHULTE, *De apostel Paulus en zijn "ziekte(n)"*, can from the medical point of view arrive at no other opinion than that Paul, though a special personality, was not a sick one. He did not suffer from a chronic disease.

² KOTY, *Die Behandlung der Alten u. Kranken b. d. Naturvölkern*, p. 100.

³ KOTY, *op. cit.*, p. 114.

⁴ KOTY, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

⁵ KOTY, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

⁶ KOTY, *op. cit.*, p. 163.

⁷ KOTY, *op. cit.*, p. 55. . . . Cf. KRUYT, *Animisme*, p. 443 ff.: epilepsy, insanity and such diseases are caused by lower spirits.

have given me a good ring.' ”¹ The ring is a reward for the exorcist. Compare the “do not return” with “enter no more into him” in Mk. 9 : 25. In both cases we have the periodicity of the attacks. Matthew calls the boy “lunatick.” According to STRACK-BILLERBECK it is not certain whether the moon is meant as a natural cause of disease or whether it was believed that during the periods of moonlight the evil spirit manifested its malign influence.² According to Galen the phases of the moon influenced the attacks of epileptics,³ whilst the Greek physician Aretaeus states that epilepsy was regarded as a visitation of persons who had sinned against the moon.⁴ CALVIN is firmly convinced of the influence of the moon; he says that “those persons are called lunatic who suffer from fits when the moon waxes and wanes. . . For experience teaches us with certainty that these sicknesses grow better or worse with the course of the moon; yet this does not alter the fact that Satan has mingled his attacks with natural means. I am therefore of the opinion that this man was not deaf and dumb by nature, but that his tongue and his ears were possessed by the devil.”⁵ CALVIN thus sees in the healing of lunatics a proof of Jesus’ divinity, since “we know that such sicknesses cannot be healed by natural means.”⁶ As we know nothing about a causal connection between the moon and epilepsy, it is useless for us to lose ourselves in further speculations.

¹ RIVERS, *Medicine, Magic and Religion*, p. 34.

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 758 . . . TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish Magic and Superstition*, p. 255, on the belief in the influence of the moon held in the Middle Ages by Jews and Christians. “Eleazar of Worms diagnosed a mental ailment as due to the contraction of the brain during the last quarters of the moon, and its expansion during the first.”

³ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*; cf. MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 58. There was an amulet, *selēnis*, for epileptic children. MEAD, *Medica Sacra*, p. 78 f.

⁴ MICKLEM, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

⁵ CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mk. 9 : 17: “Lunatici autem vocantur, qui vel sub lunae defectum comitali morbo laborant, vel torquentur vertigine . . . docet enim certa experientia pro lunae cursu augeri vel decrescere morbos illos: neque tamen hoc obstat quominus Satan naturalibus mediis suos impetus permiscuerit. Ego itaque existimo non fuisse naturaliter surdum ac mutum hunc hominem, sed linguam eius et aures a Satana fuisse possessas.” Cf. re Mt. 4 : 23.

⁶ CALVIN, *op. cit.*, re Mt. 4 : 23: “Lunatici vocantur in quibus augecit vis morbi vel decrescit pro lunae inclinatione: quales sunt qui comitali morbo laborant, et similes. Quum sciamus eiusmodi morbos naturalibus remediis non esse curabiles, sequitur testatam fuisse divinitatem Christi quum eos mirabiliter sanavit.”

According to the writings of the rabbis, the Jews regarded epilepsy as a particularly malignant disease. The victim is seized, held fast, by a demon. Under certain circumstances the danger of being attacked by this demon is great, so that one should be very much on one's guard.¹ Thirty years ago the belief was held by some in Palestine that epilepsy is caused by a demon in the form of a bird and, since this bird demon is difficult to catch, the disease was regarded as practically incurable.² Understandably, on account of the mysterious nature of this disease all kinds of antidotes and medicines were sought. In the temple of Aesculapius at Epidauros a man from Argos was cured of epilepsy. "He saw in sleep in the temple a vision: he dreamed that the deity stood before him and pressed the ring on his finger against the man's mouth, nostrils and ears, and he was cured."³ Here we find the healing ring, the magic ring, which we encounter again and again.⁴ "Solomon's ring" was much used against epilepsy.⁵ According to tradition Joseph of Arimathea was the first to bring the gospel to Britain. He is also said to have borrowed some of the lore in the books of Solomon and to have revealed to the early Britons the technique of healing epilepsy by rings.

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries cramp rings, i.e. rings to avert or cure cramp, were used in England against epilepsy in particular.⁶ In the Middle Ages the epileptic placed coins under the corporal during Mass, from which he then had a ring made.⁷ There

¹ BLAU, *Das altjüdische Zaubерwesen*, p. 55 f. Pesahim 112b states: "He who stands naked in front of a lamp will be an epileptic, and he who cohabits by the light of a lamp will have epileptic children" (ed. Epstein, transl. H. Freedman). Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 758.

² CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 45 . . . CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Strom.*, VII, VI, 33, states that "it is claimed" that eating goat's meat makes one prone to the falling sickness.

³ HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 33, miracle 62.

⁴ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 109 ff. Aristophanes already knew of the ring as a remedy. See FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, VIII, II, 5. LUCIANUS, *Philopseudes*, cap. 17, a ring as protection against demons.

⁵ For Solomon as a destroyer of demons see PETERSON, *op. cit.*, p. 106 ff. Cf. SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, III, p. 294 ff.; REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, p. 293, tells of an account in the *Parisinus graec.* 2316, which describes an amulet first given to Moses in Egypt and then to Solomon which helped against all kinds of ills, including epilepsy . . . The Talmud (*Gittin* 68) tells how Asmodai, the king of the demons, swallowed Solomon's ring and hurled the then defenceless Solomon 400 parasangs, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1, p. 512.

⁶ BLOCH, *Les rois thaumaturges*, p. 160 f.

⁷ STEPLINGER, *Antiker Aberglaube*, p. 41: "Ebenso erzählt schon Gregor

were other means of averting epilepsy than the ring, such as blood. Pliny says that the still warm blood of gladiators helped against epilepsy.¹ It is told that as late as the end of the seventeenth century an attempt was made in Holland to heal an epileptic boy by means of the blood of a beheaded criminal.²

All these strange means of averting and combating epilepsy demonstrate that people were at a loss what to do about this disease, and it is only against this broad background that the healing of the epileptic boy really comes to the fore as a deed of divine power and mercy. According to FENNER we are concerned here not with epilepsy, but probably with hysteria. He opposes Ebstein's view that falling into fire and water occurs only among epileptics by pointing out that a hysteric can injure himself just as easily.³ Moreover, epileptics are said not to be susceptible to any mental influence.⁴ As long as the symptoms are used as the criterion of whether Jesus' healings do or do not succeed, or whether they can succeed, and as long as attempts are made to find analogies, there will be evidence of other views of the power of Jesus Christ than the Gospels offer us.

von Tours, dass man Besessene und Epileptiker mit Erfolg mit Altartüchern bedeckte."

¹ See PLINY, *Hist. nat.*, XXVIII, II: "Sanguinem quoque gladiatorum bibunt ut viventibus poculis comitiales [morbi], quod spectare facientes in eadem harena feras quoque horror est . . . Artemon calvaria interfecti neque cremati propinavit aquam e fonte noctu comitialibus morbis." The strangest "medicines" are recommended, see XXVIII, LXIII; XXX, XXVII; XXVI, LXX. STRACK, *Das Blut im Glauben u. Aberglauben der Menschheit*, p. 27. Aëtius and Alexander of Tralles, physicians in the Byzantine period (3rd-6th centuries) recommended the use of blood as a remedy for epilepsy.

² VAN ANDEL, *op. cit.*, p. 28. Cf. pp. 27 and 35. In Spain the spectators at a bull fight dip their handkerchiefs in the blood of the dead bull to use it as medicine. STRACK, *op. cit.*, p. 43. In Buck, Schwaben, 44, the following appears: "Das Blut hingerichteter armer Sünder, warm getrunken, hilft Fallsüchtigen." This is also stated in other works. Cf. p. 61: the Aargauer Zeitung of 19 May, 1861, reports the confession of a man who had murdered a woman so that he could drink her blood as medicine against his disease, viz. epilepsy.

³ FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 42 ff. . . MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 58 ff., classifies this case under demoniac possession; he is of the opinion that the dividing line between hysteria and epilepsy is very difficult to draw. But see VEDDER, *Inleiding tot de psychiatrie*, p. 134, on the difference between hysterical fits and epilepsy (rigidity of the pupil, tongue-biting, cyanosis, clonic spasms, etc.), which can last 5 to 10 minutes, whilst a fit of hysteria may last hours. HAMER, *Zielszorg en Psychiatrie*, pp. 56 ff. and 169 ff.

⁴ HEIM, *Zur Frage der Wunderheilungen*, p. 413. Even Coué's pupils readily admit this.

5. *The dumb demoniac*

In Mt. 9 : 27-34 two healings are reported: in verses 27-31 that of two blind men and in verses 32-34 that of a dumb demoniac. There was a coming and going of sick persons; whilst the blind men, their sight restored, were leaving, a dumb demoniac was brought to Jesus.¹ This story is not, as some assume, identical with Mt. 12 : 22-24, for this account speaks of a demoniac who was blind and dumb. Lk. 11 : 14-15 contains, in another context, an account in much the same words. The man is not deaf and dumb, but only dumb, as emerges from verse 33: the man "spake." Deaf-dumbness is defined in greater detail.² The evil spirit that has brought about the deafness is driven out, but we do not know how Jesus did this. Not a word is said about the duration or the intensity of the disease, and nothing can be concluded from the fact that he was "brought," Mt. 9 : 32. Perhaps this was a mental disturbance; according to SENG we fairly often encounter loss of speech as a symptom in mental disturbances.³ One of the accounts of the healings of Aesculapius in Epidaurus states that once a dumb boy was placed under a certain obligation in the temple. "Then the boy suddenly cried out: 'I accept the obligation.' The father was startled and compelled him to say it once

¹ κωφός means both deaf and dumb. The Hebrew for dumb is אָלֵם and for deaf שָׁמֵן. The latter word is also often used by the rabbis for deaf and dumb; cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 526. STRACK-BILLERBECK and KLOSTERMANN, Das Matthäusevangelium, translate by "dumb demoniac." ALLEN, St. Matthew, has "dumb", as does MOFFATT, The New Testament . . . BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 226, classifies Mt. 9 : 32-34 among the "Wundergeschichten" and regards it as a variant of Mt. 12 : 22-24 and parallel passage.

² See Mk. 7 : 32: they brought to him a κωφὸν καὶ μωγῶλον. Mk. 9 : 25: τὸ ἄλλων καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα. PREUSS, Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin, p. 336 f., says that it follows from Ps. 38 : 14 that a deaf man was designated by "cheresch" and a dumb man by "illem." In the Talmud a deaf and dumb man is usually called "cheresch," whilst in the Tosephta "cheresch" is someone who can speak but not hear; "illem" is someone who can hear but cannot speak. "Sonach bleibt es in vielen Fällen zweifelhaft, ob der Talmud von einem Tauben oder einem Taubstummen spricht."

³ SENG, Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung, p. 19: "Ob es auch psychogene Taubstummheit gibt, weiss ich nicht, glaube aber, dass wir die Konstatierung gleichzeitiger Taubheit damals nicht sehr tragisch zu nehmen brauchen." MICKLEM, Miracles and the New Psychology, p. 116: "In modern practice it is admitted that deafness and disabilities of speech are symptoms which may be 'hysterical', in the sense of being initiated by suggestion and curable by psychotherapy. Deafness and mutism (of varying degrees of completeness) are comparatively often associated together." Many cases are known of soldiers who have suffered from hysterical aphonia.

again. He said it once again. And after that he was healthy.”¹ A well-known story is that told by HERODOTUS about the dumb son of Kroisos. When the son saw his father in deadly peril, he cried out: “O man, do not kill Kroisos!” and from then on “he spoke all the time of his life.”² It is therefore not impossible to suppose that the story of the dumb demoniac relates to such a symptom, if we bear in mind that this is nothing more than a supposition.

The statement that the multitude cried out in amazement: “It was never so seen in Israel,” Mt. 9 : 33, need not relate only to the last healing, but may be regarded as a summarizing opinion of the absolutely unique manner in which Jesus healed the sick and the possessed. Several manuscripts do not contain the remark of the Pharisees: “He casteth out devils through the prince of the devils,” Mt. 9 : 34. This “prince of the devils” is Beelzebub. In the following pericope about the healing of the blind and dumb demoniac, Mt. 12 : 22-24, Beelzebub is mentioned by name in a pronouncement of approximately the same wording. Who was meant by this “prince of the devils?” The last word has not yet been said about the meaning of the name Beelzebub, whilst there are also various spellings of it; we find Beelzebub, Beezebul and Beelzebul. The name Beelzebub recalls the lord of the flies of Ekron, 2 Ki. 1 : 2 ff.³ STRACK-BILLERBECK thinks the origin lies in the Hebrew word for “manuring.” Beelzebub is thus the “god of manure;” the sacrifices to the idols are worthless, they are “manure.” We also find the view that Baal-Zebul is the “lord of the dwelling,” in which “dwelling” may relate both to the sky, the air, and to the spirit of the possessed person in which the

¹ HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 11, miracle 5. Cf. p. 27, miracle 44: “als diese im Heiligtum herumliegend, sah sie eine Schlange von einem der Bäume im Hain herabkriechen; voller Furcht schreit sie sofort nach ihrer Mutter und ihrem Vater; und sie ging gesund weg.”

² HERODOTUS, *Historiae*, I, cap. 85. According to BAUMANN, *Psyche's lijden*, p. 73, this boy was suffering from psychogenic mutism. PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 346. According to Preuss we have here the oldest example of hysterical dumbness . . . See also Hagigah 3a: “But behold there were two dumb men in the neighbourhood of Rabbi, sons of the daughter of R. Johanan b. Gudgada, and according to others, sons of the sister of R. Johanan, who, whenever Rabbi entered the college, went in and sat down (before him), and nodded their heads and moved their lips. And Rabbi prayed for them and they were cured, and it was found that they were versed in Halachah, Sifra, Sifre and the whole Talmud!” (ed. Epstein; transl. I. Abrahams).

³ CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 59 f. He sees here traces of insect worship: lord of the flies; Baal himself was a fly. Cf. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 272. Note the substitution Belial-Beliar.

demon dwells. Another meaning is thought to be "lord of enmity."¹ REITZENSTEIN offers an entirely different opinion. He says that in the "extremely interesting Jewish prayers to the planets" certain angels and demons are allotted to various planets. The mighty planet Saturn has only one angel, Ktetoel, and only one demon, Beelzebub.

Medieval astrology, which is connected with the Jewish form, knows Saturn as the "seat of the devil." Well now, says REITZENSTEIN, the Pharisees know this secret wisdom: Beelzebub may be a Phoenician deity, but in these days the name Beelzebub does not form part of Jewish popular belief, but of the secret lore of astrology.² The discovery of the Ras-Shamra texts has possibly thrown a new light on the name Beelzebub. These texts speak of the god Aleyan-Baal, the strong one, the god of running water and of vegetation who, as god of the fertile earth, is also called Zbl.³

It is more or less immaterial whether this pronouncement of the Pharisees is an addition or not.⁴ It may be that the association between Jesus and Beelzebub, the prince of the devils, was so constantly on the lips of the Pharisees that the words almost wrote themselves when this healing was being described.

6. *The blind and dumb demoniac*

Mt. 12 : 22-24 describes in a few words the healing of a demoniac who was blind and dumb, a healing which gives rise to the discussion between Jesus and the Pharisees on Beelzebub. In Lk. 11 : 14-15 the healing of the dumb demoniac leads to this discussion, whilst Mark has another introduction, Mk. 3 : 22 ff.⁵ We are struck at once by the fact that there is no reference here to the expulsion of demons; instead it is said that "he healed him." Only the result is stated: "the blind and dumb both spake and saw." It is possible that in the case of this patient there were psychogenic causes; WOR-

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 632. FOERSTER, TWNT, I, p. 605.

² REITZENSTEIN, *Poimandres*, p. 75 f. The prayers to the planets are in the Cod. Par. 2419. According to Reitzenstein Jesus' speech, Mt. 12 : 43-45, cf. Lk. 11 : 24-26, is likewise connected with this planetary doctrine.

³ DE GROOT in G. VAN DER LEEUW, *De Godsdiensten der wereld*, I, p. 266. But see FOERSTER, TWNT, I, p. 605, note 4, on the difference of opinion about the meaning of Zbl.

⁴ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, deletes Mt. 9 : 34 on the strength of various manuscripts.

⁵ See the analysis in ALLEN, *St. Matthew . . .* BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 10, classifies Mt. 12 : 22-24 (37) among the apophthegms, Streit- u. Schulgespräche.

CESTER believes the illness to have been hysterical neurosis; when the hysteria is healed the symptoms of blindness and deafness disappear.¹ However, ignorance of further data on the anamnesis of the disease urges caution in our explanations. The people "were amazed," but the Pharisees said: "This fellow doth not cast out devils, but by Beelzebub the prince of the devils." With these words the Pharisees brand Jesus a magician and His work that of the devil. The name Beelzebub does not occur in Jewish literature as a name for Satan.² The Pharisees mean by Beelzebub the prince of the devils, whilst Jesus identifies him with Satan, Mt. 12 : 26. Lord of the flies, manure god, lord of the dwelling, lord of enmity, demon of Saturn or lord of the earth³ — whatever Beelzebub originally meant, and who shall say what new meaning may perhaps yet be found? — the name Beelzebub is in any case associated with a mighty prince of demons, by whom the Pharisees believed that Jesus was possessed. In His answer Jesus, as we have already pointed out, said clearly what happens in the healings: "then the kingdom of God is come unto you;" then the power of God's love is manifested visibly and tangibly.

7. *Mary Magdalene*

Lk. 8 : 1-3 contains the account of the women who ministered to Jesus during His journey with the twelve. Luke, who is alive to social life,⁴ gives woman her place here, perhaps already as a "preparation" for the place which she will occupy in the Passion and death of Jesus.⁵ Three women are mentioned by name, Mary Magdalene, Joanna and Susanna. GREYDANUS' surmise that Luke named these women: "because they were already honourably and widely known when he wrote his Gospel," is plausible.⁶ It cannot be deduced from the account who else, besides Mary Magdalene, was

¹ WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, *Religion and Medicine*, p. 361. SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 19. According to Seng psychogenic blindness is still a vexed question. In any case it is not a common occurrence.

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 631 f.

³ See the explanation of the name Beelzebub in the preceding pericope.

⁴ BROUWER, *Jezus en de sociale vragen*, p. 197: "Luke, the pagan Christian, displays a certain predilection for emphasizing that women played such an important part in Jesus' life."

⁵ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*.

⁶ GREYDANUS, *Lukas* . . . Her name is mentioned among other places in the Gospel of Peter, whilst she is extolled in the Pistis Sophia as the "pneumatic and pure," cf. W. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 448 f.

liberated from evil spirits. According to the text there was more than one woman.¹

The case of Mary Magdalene is singled out: out of her went seven devils. The attempt to identify her with the sinner mentioned in Lk. 7 : 36-50 must certainly be regarded as a failure, since we nowhere read that possession "was related to special sinfulness."²

She is distinguished from the other Marys by the surname Magdalene, which designates her birthplace, viz. Magdala, a fishing village on the Sea of Galilee.³ The Evangelists nowhere state that Jesus visited this place, so that Mary probably met Jesus elsewhere.⁴ Mary Magdalene is mentioned several times,⁵ and in Mk. 16 : 9 her miraculous healing is recalled, which indicates that this event made a considerable impression and formed a part of permanent tradition. The reference to the symptoms, possession by seven devils, has given rise to various views. The possibility has been suggested of dependence on the Babylonian doctrine of the seven evil spirits, or on the seven planets.⁶ The number seven, which according to RENGSTORF does not relate to the seven planets, but to the observation of the four phases of the moon, each of approximately seven days, indicates a fullness, a totality.⁷ We must therefore bear in mind here the special

¹ See Luke 8 : 2. PLUMMER, *St. Luke*: "perhaps only Mary Magdalen," the others were doubtless healed "of infirmities."

² GREYDANUS, *Lukas. KOPP, Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 246 f. Mary Magdalene must be identified neither with the sinner nor with Mary of Bethany . . . DE RÉGLA, *Jésus de Nazareth*, p. 159, says that Mary Magdalene was healed of hysteria. "Elle renonça à la vie très scabreuse qu'elle avait menée."

³ DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 134 ff. Cf. KOPP, *op. cit.*, pp. 246-251.

⁴ The figure of Mary Magdalene has heated the imagination of a number of authors. A completely nonsensical view is that of Pierre Nahor (Emilie Lerou), *Jesus*, 1905, who believes that Jesus had healed Mary Magdalene, who was a prominent courtesan from Tiberias and whom he had already once met in Alexandria. She then retired to a small house in Magdala. See SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 359.

⁵ Mt. 27 : 56, 61; 28 : 1; Mk. 15 : 40, 47; 16 : 1, 9; Lk. 24 : 10; Jn. 19 : 25; 20 : 1, 11, 16, 18.

⁶ SMITH, *Der vorchristliche Jesus*, points to the seven "Geister des Irrtums" from the Testament of Ruben, II, 3 (p. 164), to a Babylonian sevenfold deity (p. 22) and to an old Assyrian magic chant (p. 225). CLEMEN, *Religionsgesch. Erklär. des N.T.*, p. 87, rejects views like these. EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 56, recalls a jewel, a woman's head with seven dragon-heads. Cf. E. LOHMEYER, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, with reference to Rev. 12 : 3, the Babylonian dragon with the seven heads.

⁷ RENGSTORF, *TWNT*, II, p. 623 ff. . . . LANGTON, *op. cit.*, p. 150, sees in the expression "seven spirits," Mt. 12 : 45; Lk. 11 : 26 and Lk. 8 : 2 ("seven devils"), a link "between Synoptic teaching and Babylonian beliefs." Cf. p. 18 ff. Seven

nature of the number seven: we are concerned with a state of complete misery, a misery which cannot be exceeded.¹ "We need not give any mystical interpretation to the number seven: comp. XI, 26; Mt. XII, 45," says PLUMMER rightly.² OESTERREICH mentions the case of a certain Jeanne des Anges through whom seven demons spoke: Asmodeus, Leviathan, Behemoth, Isacaaron, Balaam, Gre-silis and Aman.³ Here the number seven is thus meant as a figure. It is impossible exactly to identify the disease from which Mary Magdalene was suffering. The "seven devils" indicate a seriously split personality; the ego seems to be displaced again and again by a more powerful ego. Jesus liberated this woman from her malignant mental disturbance and her gratitude expressed itself in devoted following and ministration.

8. *The daughter of the woman of Canaan*

One of those who were freed from an evil spirit by Jesus was the daughter of the woman from a pagan environment, Mt. 15 : 21-28, Mk. 7 : 24-30. The differences between Matthew's account and that of Mark are striking, and give rise to the suspicion that more than one tradition was in circulation.⁴ The geographical details are difficult to clear up.⁵ "Jesus went thence;" does this "thence" refer to the house mentioned in Mk. 7 : 17? ⁶ Matthew describes the woman as coming from Canaan, whereas Mark says that she was "a Greek, a Syrophenician by nation." At quite an early stage efforts were made to eliminate this discrepancy by saying that, whilst

= a large number. As regards Mary Magdalene: "she was believed to be a victim of spirit obsession of special malignancy" (p. 150).

¹ RENGSTORF, op. cit., p. 627.

² PLUMMER, St. Luke. "It indicates a possession of extraordinary malignity." KLAUSNER, From Jesus to Paul, p. 255. "... Mary Magdalene 'from whom seven demons had gone out', that is to say, a woman hysterical to the point of madness."

³ OESTERREICH, Die Besessenheit, p. 25.

⁴ See ALLEN, St. Matthew ... BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 38, classifies Mk. 7 : 24-30 and parallel passage as an apophthegm, although it has no pronouncement by Jesus as point. HELD, Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch. (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 189), says that Mk. and Mt. obviously had different audiences in mind. Mk. shows the pagan Christians that the priority of the Jews must be recognized (Mk. 7 : 27, πρῶτον); Mt. makes it clear to the Jewish Christians that faith opens the way to Jesus for the pagans.

⁵ See DALMAN, Orte u. Wege, p. 211 ff.; SMIT, De Daemoniacis, p. 402 ff. KOPP, Die heiligen Stätten der Ev., p. 288.

⁶ SCHMIDT, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, p. 198. ... SMIT, De Daemoniacis, p. 414: from the region of Capernaum.

the woman was a Syro-Phoenician, her family came from Canaan.¹ GOPPELT points out that "Tyros and Sidon" are used in "characteristic" fashion in the Old Testament to designate the pagan world. The purpose of the story is to illustrate Jesus' attitude to the pagans: salvation is for those who believe, but it is offered first to Israel and then to the pagans.² Mark states that Jesus went into "an house." That is all that he states, and guessing brings us no further.³ Then the encounter between Jesus and the woman seeking aid is related. Later the mother was given the name Justa and her daughter the name Berenice.⁴ The fame of Jesus' miraculous power knew no frontiers, and the woman even knew the title "Son of David," Mt. 15 : 22.⁵ Mark says nothing about the attitude of the disciples, who ask Jesus to send the troublesome woman away. The account reaches a climax in the conversation between Jesus and the woman,⁶

¹ CLEMENS ROMANUS, Hom., II, 19: "There is among us a certain Justa, a Syro-Phoenician, of the people of Canaan, whose little daughter was tormented by a serious disease, and who came to our Lord, calling upon him and begging him to heal her daughter." See the whole passage in SMIT, *De Daemoniacis*, p. 412 f. SCHMIDT, op. cit., p. 199: when Matthew puts "of Canaan" instead of Syro-Phoenician: "so ist das wohl ein altertümlicher, aus der 'Bibel' geschöpfter Ausdruck, da die Phönizier als Nachkommen der alten Kanaanäer gelten mochten. Es spricht sich in diesem Terminus eine Schriftgelehrsamkeit aus, wie wir sie Mt. 4, 12 ff. kennen gelernt haben." HAUCK, Markus: "So nannte man die zur Provinz Syrien gehörigen Phönizier im Unterschied von den afrikanischen Libophöniziern (Strabo 17, 3)." See CHAJES, *Markus-Studien*, p. 43 ff.; SMIT, *De Daemoniacis*, p. 410 ff.; KEULERS, *Mattheüs*; KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*.

² GOPPELT, *Typos*, p. 87. GOPPELT, *Christentum u. Judentum*, p. 37 ff., 2. Jesus und Israel. "In den Tagen Jesu wäre selbst ein pharisäischer Rabbi, in der Hoffnung, einen Proselyten machen zu können (Mt. 23, 15), bereitwillig auf die Bitte der Heidin eingegangen. Jesus versagt, was ein Rabbi oder auch ein Prophet wie Elia gewährt hätten! Jesu Antwort ist nur zu verstehen als Ausdruck des Wissens um eine einzigartige heilsgeschichtliche Sendung" (p. 39). VAN LEEUWEN, Markus: the Evangelist doubtless regarded the healing in pagan country as a symbol and prophecy of the effect of the gospel outside Jewry. VAN DEN BERGH v. EYSINGA, *Verklaring v.h. Ev. naar Matth.*, p. 143: "We have here a symbolic and allegoric account of the entry of pagans into the Church."

³ SCHMIDT, op. cit., p. 198: "Vom Übel ist alles weitere Fragen nach den geographischen Details, ob das Haus im Heidenlande das Haus eines Jesusverehrsers oder das eines Heiden sei, wo genau der Ort der Szene sei, ob zwischen Tyrus und Sidon, ob mehr im Süden oder Norden." Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*; TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 136 ff.

⁴ BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 517. CLEMENS, Hom., III, 73; IV, 1, 4, 6; II, 19; XIII, 7.

⁵ SMIT, *De Daemoniacis*, p. 416. KEULERS, *Mattheüs*.

⁶ BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 125 f., concludes from this conversation that Jesus knew Greek, and exclaims enthusiastically: "Jesus der griechischen Sprache mächtig! Was für Möglichkeiten und Ausblicke eröffnet das!"

which devolves around the following issue: is Jesus the Saviour of Israel only, or also of the pagan world?

The original refusal by Jesus — see Mt. 15 : 23: “But he answered her not a word” — though it may be clothed in the form of a parable, gives the impression of harshness. KLAUSNER even describes Jesus’ answer as being “so brusque and chauvinistic that if any other Jewish teacher of the time had said such a thing, Christians would never have forgiven Judaism for it.”¹

The comparison between children (Israel) and dogs (pagans) is not interpreted by the woman as an insult; instead she neatly turns it to her advantage: the crumbs dropped by children are after all for the dogs? In that case dogs would have to be understood to mean pet dogs.² But according to JEREMIAS pet dogs were known in Greece, but not in the East. “To understand the expression correctly, we must in the first place rid our minds of the idea of pet dogs as we know them, and think of the contempt in which dogs are held in the East, where they are a plague.”³ We find in the Talmud that dogs are now and then praised for their devotion and usefulness, but they were usually considered the “most despised, the most impertinent and the most wretched of creatures.”⁴ In any case the expression “dog” is quite explicit, but the interpretation of the woman, which bore witness to both her humility and her belief, moved Jesus deeply, so that her daughter was healed “for this saying.”⁵

¹ KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 294. . . . There is no reason to assume that Jesus was so harsh because He felt disheartened and bitter about the course of events among His fellows and considered Himself as it were an exile, as some think. VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*, rightly says: “Jesus’ motive for going beyond the boundaries of Galilee can only be guessed at.” KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*, Jesus went to the pagan country “to devote himself with less interruption to the education of his disciples.” KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 289: Jesus wanted: “nur das Alleinsein mit den Jüngern.”

² ALLEN, *St. Matthew: house-dogs*. KEULERS, *Matthäus: the diminutive “little dogs”* softens the pronouncement: “it means the smaller dogs, domestic animals and playmates for children.” MICHEL, *TWNT*, III, p. 1103 f.: “Die Wahl der Verkleinerungsform *κυνάριον* zeigt, dass Jesus an kleine Hunde denkt, die in der Wohnung des Menschen geduldet werden.”

³ JEREMIAS, *Babylonisches im N.T.*, p. 100. . . . There are contemptuous references to dogs in Deu. 23 : 18; 1 Sa. 17 : 43; 24 : 14; 2 Sa. 3 : 8; 9 : 8; 16 : 9; 2 Ki. 8 : 13; Job 30 : 1; Isa. 66 : 3; Mt. 7 : 6; Phil. 3 : 2; Rev. 22 : 15. Cf. MICHEL, *TWNT*, III, p. 1100 ff.

⁴ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 722 ff. Cf. SMIT, *De Daemoniacis*, p. 424.

⁵ According to KLAUSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 294, the mother found her child at home on the bed, “passive after an attack of frenzy.” TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 138: “Jesus was delighted by her wit. ‘For this word,’ he said, ‘go

Upon her return home the woman found her child released from the evil spirit. ¹

your way; the daemon has left your daughter' —a confident assurance based on supernatural knowledge, and not necessarily a miracle wrought at a distance."

¹ For the healing "at a distance," see the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment. PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, II, p. 304, says that Jesus knew that the daughter was already better, see Mk. 7 : 29. "Auf alle Fälle scheint es daher: Jesus hatte, während er der Frau eine harte Aussenseite zeigen musste, schon von seiner Wohnung aus einen der Apostel, welche bereits sonst gegen Dämonien gewirkt hatten, zur Heilung des Mädchens, ehe es die Mutter hoffte, abgeschickt. Unfreundlich in Worten, war Er desto hilfreicher in der That gewesen." A neatly rationalistic solution! MICHEL, *TWNT*, III, p. 1104: "Der Glaube der Heidin stellt sich bedingungslos unter die Messiasherrschaft Christi und empfängt gerade in dieser Bedingungslosigkeit Jesu Anerkennung und Verheissung." BARTH, *K.D.*, IV, 2, p. 190: "Und als jene Frau (nach Luthers genialer Erklärung der Stelle) das unter Jesu Nein verborgene Ja hörte und das Recht der unter dem Tisch von den Brosamen der Kinder sich nährenden Hündlein anmeldete, da fehlte es nicht, dass ihre Bitte erhört wurde, dass sie also von dem Brot der Kinder tatsächlich zu essen bekam." Cf. I, 1, p. 184 f.

II. THE HEALING OF THE BLIND

(a) *Introduction*

The Old Testament speaks several times of the blind and of the special protection that they enjoy,¹ whilst it is also prophesied on a number of occasions that God will make the blind see.² In the Talmud the blind are branded as "dead;" their lot is just as pitiable and harsh as that of the poor, the lepers and the childless.³ The New Testament contains a number of marvellous healings of blind persons, but we also encounter these elsewhere. It is said of the god Aesculapius that he healed a number of blind persons in Epidaurus. Ambrosia of Athens, who was blind in one eye and who laughed at the healings in the temple, saw in a dream that she had to sacrifice a silver pig. The next day she was healed.⁴ Alcetos of X promised to pay the deity 200 drachmae within a year. He too was healed.⁵ So was a man who was mocked at by people in the temple because he believed that he would get an eye whilst the socket was completely empty! He dreamed that Aesculapius poured a medicine between his eyelids, and when day broke he could see with both eyes.⁶

The blind lad Lyson of Hermione was licked on the eyes by a dog in the temple, and left healed.⁷ Another blind person, healed by the god, dedicated to him not a solid golden statue but a piece of wood immersed in a bath of gold. The deity afflicted the man with

¹ Lev. 19 : 14; Deu. 27 : 18 . . . עֵוֶר, blind, one-eyed. See PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 313 ff.

² Ps. 146 : 8; Isa. 29 : 18; 35 : 5; 42 : 7; 42 : 16; 42 : 18 . . . Blindness was also a consequence of divine dispensation or punishment, see Ex. 4 : 11; Deu. 28 : 28, 29; Zech. 12 : 4.

³ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 524 . . . The Talmud mentions various peculiar remedies against blindness: a scorpion prepared in a certain way, the spleen of animals, etc., whilst the following causes of blindness, among others, are mentioned: combing the hair while it is dry; putting on shoes while the feet are still wet. Eye operations are not mentioned in the Talmud, cf. EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*, p. 281 ff. PREUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 320 ff., lists all kinds of remedies against diseases of the eye.

⁴ HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 11, miracle 4: "Nachdem er (d.i. Asclepius) das gesagt, habe er ihr das kranke Auge aufgeschlitzt und ein Heilmittel eingegossen" (cf. Jn. 9). Cf. EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, p. 221 ff.

⁵ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 35, miracle 69.

⁶ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 13, miracle 9.

⁷ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 17, miracle 20.

blindness again, and he was not rehealed until he had sacrificed a solid gold statue.¹ A blind man lost his bottle of salve whilst bathing. In a dream he was informed that the bottle was to be found in an inn. The next day his servant led him to the inn, where he suddenly saw the bottle of salve and was healed.² We mention these miracles so that it may be evident how greatly they differ from the healings of Jesus. HERZOG, who discusses the miracles of Epidauros in detail, remarks that the diagnosis, therapy and results of these cases must be judged against the background of the time and environment. "Eye trouble, usually simply referred to as blindness, has a privileged position in all old and new places of pilgrimage, since it was only at a late stage that it was treated according to the principles of rational medicines."³ Even in the case of the one-eyed man whose eye socket was empty the eyelids could have been so swollen that there was apparently a hollow space.⁴ Apollonius of Tyana⁵ and Emperor Vespasian⁶ are also said to have healed the blind. It is several times stated that people were stricken with blindness. A characteristic account is that contained in Aristee's letter: "And from the mouth of the tragedian Theodectes I learned that, when he was desirous of including in a drama something of what is writ in Scripture, he became blind in both eyes; and as he surmised that the mishap had afflicted him for that reason, he prayed to God and was healed again after some considerable time."⁷ A few words from the apostle Paul, who himself had once been struck by blindness,

¹ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 31, miracle 55.

² HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 33, miracle 65.

³ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

⁴ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 95. This is the opinion of Jesionek.

⁵ VITA APOLL., III, 39: "Another, whose eyes had flowed out, went away with his eyes fully recovered" (transl. Eells).

⁶ TACITUS, *Hist.*, IV, 81. Suetonius, *Vespasianus*, VII: "Someone from the people who had been bereft of the light of his eyes, and likewise another, who was paralysed, approached together, whilst he [Vespasian] was enthroned on his seat of judgment, and begged him to heal them, [saying] that they had had a vision of Serapis: the one would have his eyesight restored if he [Vespasian] were to spit in it; the paralytic would recover if he deigned to touch him with his heel. As he scarcely believed that the treatment would in any way succeed and he therefore did not even dare to try it, [nevertheless] he finally attempted it with the encouragement of his friends before the whole public, in both cases with a favourable result." Cf. also CASSIUS DIO, *Hist. Romana*, LXVI, 8. It is said of Emperor Hadrian that he healed a blind woman by washing her eyes; see Elius Spartianus, *Histor. Hadriani*, I, IV, 82 (LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle*, p. 429 f.).

⁷ Aristee's letter, 316 (KAUTZSCH, *Apokr. u. Pseudepigr. des Alten Testaments*, II, p. 31).

Ac. 9 : 8 ff., and the sorcerer Elymas became blind for a time, Ac. 13 : 11, whilst it is stated in the Acts of Paul that in answer to the prayers of the apostle a certain Hermippus was blinded when he sought Paul's life.¹

We have already pointed out that medical science is in the dark regarding the possibility of healing the blind, since the data are too scanty and too inexact. Of course these cases can also be ranked under the uncomplaining catch-all of "hysteria," as is done by FENNER, but this is altogether unsatisfactory.²

We remember the words of EBSTEIN that an objective assessment from the medical point of view is also impossible as regards blindness, as long as we must rely entirely on data such as those of the New Testament.³ This does not of course alter the fact that some of the patients may have been suffering from functional blindness, so that for these one can point to analogous cases which have been healed by psychotherapy, provided that it is not concluded from this that Jesus was a psychotherapist.⁴

The Gospels mention various healings of the blind separately, whilst these blind persons are also mentioned in the general lists.⁵ This shows that blindness was a very common complaint.

(b) *The healing of two blind men at Capernaum*

The healing of the two blind men at Capernaum occurs only in Mt. 9 : 27-31. Since Mt. 9 : 27-34 recounts two miracles which are not in Mark and Luke, KLOSTERMANN does not doubt that Matthew

¹ ACTA PAULI, 3, see HENNECKE, Neutestam. Apokr., p. 204 f. Cf. WEINREICH, Antike Heilungswunder, p. 57: we often encounter blinding as a punitive miracle. ESSER, Das Antlitz der Blindheit in der Antike, p. 155 ff. In particular sins with the eyes were punished by blindness. . . Cf. also Deu. 28 : 28: "The Lord shall smite thee with . . . blindness," and Zech. 12 : 4: "... and will smite every horse of the people with blindness."

² FENNER, Die Krankheit im N.T., p. 69 ff. TRAUB, Die Wunder im N.T., p. 36 f. Blindness is often connected with nervous disorders. "Wir werden demnach das Recht haben, einen Teil der Blindenheilungen vollständig in die Heilung der Dämonischen einzurechnen" (p. 37).

³ EBSTEIN, op. cit., p. 80 ff.

⁴ When MICKLEM, Miracles and the New Psychology, p. 110, remarks with reference to the blinding of Elymas, Ac. 13 : 11, that the word of Peter was the determinant, whilst the patient himself "accepted the autosuggestion of blindness," he fails to grasp the meaning of the text: "behold, the hand of the Lord is upon thee."

⁵ Mt. 11 : 5; 15: 30 f.; 21: 14; Lk. 7: 21 f. STRAUSS, Das Leben Jesu, II, p. 69, considers these healings unhistorical; they are sagas, ascribed to Jesus on the strength of Isa. 35 : 5.

here offers purely secondary variants of Mt. 20 : 29-34 and 12 : 22-24; in his opinion the form betrays pure compilation.¹ Since Mark twice reports the healing of blind persons, viz. in Mk. 8 : 22-26 and 10 : 46-52, Matthew made two blind men of one, just as he speaks of two demoniacs at Gergesa. However, what is the objection to accepting the report as it stands?² It begins with the statement that Jesus departed "thence" (the house of Jairus?) and was followed by two blind men who begged Him: "Thou Son of David, have mercy on us."³ The blind men also followed Him when He entered "the house," i.e. the house of Peter at Capernaum, where Jesus asked them: "Believe ye that I am able to do this?"⁴ Upon their answering in the affirmative Jesus touched their eyes and said: "According to your faith be it unto you."⁵ The sick had thus to have unconditional confidence. After the sick men had received a strictly worded⁶ injunction to silence they left, but immediately contravened Jesus' command. We have elsewhere stated our opinion that Jesus did not intend His injunction to silence to prevent a commotion about His person, but that He imposed these bans because the time for full revelation had not yet come.

¹ KLOSTERMANN, Das Matthäusevangelium. BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 228. Mt. 9 : 27-31 is: "wie Mt. 9, 32-34 sekundäre schriftstellerische Arbeit des Mt." Bultmann classifies it among the "Wundergeschichten." According to HELD, Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch. (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 209), Mt. 9 : 27 ff. is: "eine matthäische Neuerzählung der synoptischen Blindenheilung in Mt. 20, 29-34."

² Cf. the exposition in KEULERS, Mattheüs, SCHMIDT, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu, p. 201, does not see Mt. 9 : 27-34 as doublets of 20 : 29-34 and 12 : 22-24. There are too many distinguishing features. "Vor allem traut man der urchristlichen Überlieferung einen zu kleinen Schatz an Geschichten zu." Of course there were doublets, but one may not reduce everything to one archetype.

³ Cf. Mk. 10 : 47; Mt. 20 : 31. PERELS, Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker, p. 14, points out that the words of those seeking aid belong to the "heart of the miracle stories." Attempts should not be made to seek later material in them. In the Synoptists a great part of the verbal material is "wesensmässig zugehörig."

⁴ KEULERS, Mattheüs, rightly remarks that in view of Matthew 8 : 20 it is improbable that Jesus had a home of his own . . . See BRAUN, TWNT, VI, p. 471, for the "doing," ποιεῖν, of miracles by Jesus.

⁵ For touching of the eyes, cf. Matthew 20 : 34; for touching as such see the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment . . . KEULERS, Mattheüs, makes a good comment on Mt. 9 : 29, viz. that there is no question here of suggestion. "It would be strange if precisely those blind persons healed by Jesus had suffered from hysterical blindness."

⁶ ἐμβριμάσθαι really means the snorting of recalcitrant horses. By extension it came to mean to address angrily, to be abusive, to murmur. Cf. Mk. 1 : 43; 14 : 5, and Jn. 11 : 33, 38. Cf. EITREM, Demonology, p. 41 f.

(c) *The healing of the blind man of Bethsaida*

The account of this healing is to be found only in Mk. 8 : 22-26. There is a difference of opinion regarding the exact location of Bethsaida; possibly Bethsaida Julias is meant, situated on the north-eastern shore of the Sea of Galilee, which was built by the tetrarch Philippos and named after the daughter of Emperor Augustus.¹ A number of persons brought a blind man to Jesus and begged Him to touch the man. VAN LEEUWEN concludes from this that the initiative seemed to come more from the helpers than from the man himself, as in Mk. 7 : 32 ff., and that possibly in both cases this is why "the way in which Jesus performed the healings differs from that of the remaining healing miracles."² Was that why Jesus took him out of the town? KEULERS presumes that Jesus did this to avoid the enthusiasm and admiration of the people.³ Or did Jesus perhaps act only as an ordinary "miracle healer" of those days, who did not want to be troubled by distrustful spectators? We can never do more than guess whether Jesus acted in this way for His own sake, for that of the blind man or for that of the people. The remarkable course of the healing has, however, given rise to a number of questions: why the twofold treatment of spitting on the eyes and laying on hands,⁴ followed by a question and then a second laying on of hands? EITREM considers the case as such difficult.⁵ BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL wonders whether Jesus was "inhibited" by something,⁶ whilst GOULD remarks that the narrative

¹ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, XVIII, II, 1. *De bello Jud.*, II, IX, 1. . . . For details see SCHÜRER, *op. cit.*, II, p. 161 f. Cf. DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 178 f., 189. DALMAN rejects the view of Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 205, who on the basis of Codex D reads Bethany for Bethsaida, and seeks the place near Scythopolis. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 230 ff. It was definitely Bethsaida Julias. Cf. GROLLENBERG-VAN DEURSEN, *Atlas van de Bijbel*. According to BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 68, the reference to Bethsaida is "Redaktionsarbeit"; verse 23 speaks of a *κώμη*, which Bethsaida was not; cf. p. 227 f. . . . DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, classifies the story among the "Novellen;" BULTMANN includes it among the "Wundergeschichten," *op. cit.*, p. 227.

² VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*.

³ KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*.

⁴ See for this the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment . . . Healing in stages also occurs elsewhere, cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, and HAUCK, *Markus*, who refer to the Neugriechischen Märchen, edited by P. Kretschmer, 1917. See also BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 240.

⁵ EITREM, *op. cit.*, p. 45: "apparently this cure is a difficult one, being completed in two stages."

⁶ BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, *Markus*.

gives us "no clue to the meaning of it." ¹) It strikes us that in the healing of the man born blind in John 9 we also find a double treatment: first the anointing of the eyes with clay, and then the washing of the eyes in the pool of Siloam.

However, the difference between the two accounts is too great for them to be regarded as one and the same incident.

After spitting on the eyes and laying on hands, Jesus asked if the man could see anything. The man looked up, i.e. he raised his eyes, and not he saw again, and answered: "I see men as trees, walking." It is evident from this that the man had not always been blind. ² A remarkable feature is his mentioning trees: we also encounter this in a healing in Epidauros. ³ Upon the second laying on of hands the man "was restored, ⁴ and saw every man clearly." ⁵

¹ GOULD, St. Mark.

² VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 434, speaks of periodical blindness. KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*, the man "had probably not always been blind." KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*. MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 343. VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*, "he was evidently not born blind." SCHNIEWIND, *Das NTD*, I, 1 . . . Upon my requesting the Director of the Home for the Blind in Rotterdam to furnish me with information in this matter, I received the answer that persons born blind do not have an exact idea of objects, and that they also declared that they could not correctly visualize trees. "The supposition that the blind man in Mark 8 : 24 had possessed the power of sight before becoming blind must be taken as correct," states the Director. Cf. RÉVÉSZ et al., *Het persoonlijk en sociale leven van de blinden*, Speciaal gedeelte, Ch. X: *De voorstellingswereld der blinden*, pp. 60-62. A man born blind has no idea of the space that surrounds him. "A person born blind cannot therefore really visualize the external world of the sighted in the true sense of the word" (p. 60). It is much less difficult for those who become blind at a later age to recognize flat surfaces, shapes, etc., than for those born blind. "But the question of the extent to which the optical images of those who become blind at a later age have retained their original content, and how far former experiences, memories, have been modified in the state of blindness, is difficult to answer" (p. 61). In any case it may be concluded from our text that, having regard to the modification, the man had been blind for a long time . . . FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, believes that we have here: "eine medizinisch durchaus begreifliche psychogene hysterische Erscheinung" (p. 71). According to SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 19, there is still considerable difference of opinion about blindness through mental causes. "Davon, dass sie etwa häufig vorkommt, kann jedenfalls keine Rede sein."

³ HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 16 f., miracle 18. The blind Alcetas of Halieis dreamed: "that the deity came to him and opened his eyes with his fingers; then he saw the trees in the temple for the first time. When day dawned he left, healed." See DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*, on the combination of man and tree in the world of ideas of children and primitive peoples.

⁴ ἀποκαθίστημι is a medical term.

⁵ Note the compounds of βλέπω with ἄνα, δια and ἐμ, which indicates a climax in seeing. Cf. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 240, which

The fact of complete healing is stressed, and therefore the remark by BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, "Jesus' victorious certainty about the disease is entirely absent," is incorrect. Where is the "unmistakably sombre tone" of Mark's account when the utterance of the healed man is put into direct speech — and that is how it will have to be heard, since he alone can have said it — : "I now see everything clearly!" Surely this is far more a tone of victory. We therefore believe that the question which BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL poses, viz. whether "this blind man who slowly begins to see" is characteristic of the development of the book, since the disciples are not yet able to see "clearly", must be answered in the negative.¹ CALVIN has in our opinion gone right to the heart of the question why Mark has preserved the remarkable course of this healing when he says that Jesus wanted to use this to give a picture of His free dispensation of mercy and wanted to show "that he is not bound by fixed rules but can show his power both in this way and in that." The grace of Christ flowed to this man as it were "drop by drop," according to CALVIN.²

Jesus did not heal the man for the purpose of demonstrating to him the "sign" that a not yet complete belief is answered by an originally incomplete cure³ — not a single word is said about the man's faith! — or to teach the disciples symbolically, but in part to manifest in His display of divine mercy to a man in need the om-

mentions an example from the Neugriechischen Märchen, edited by P. Kretschmer, 1917, in which a blind man first could see a little, after his eyes had been anointed four times, and could see entirely after his eyes had been anointed six times . . . CARADOG JONES, *Spiritual Healing*, p. 143, reports the case of a boy cured of blindness in Lourdes. The doctors accepted it as "a first-class miracle." He "saw" a twig on the ground when he did "the stations of the cross." "On being examined at the Bureau by the doctors it was found that he could see quite well with both eyes, although from a medical point of view he was still blind, both optic nerves being apparently useless and pathologically dead. His field of vision was restricted at first but was soon afterwards extended to normal." After a considerable time had passed the optic nerves also began to function normally again.

¹ BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, Markus.

² CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mk. 8 : 23: "quod ideo factum esse probabile est, ut documentum in hoc homine statueret liberae suae dispensationis, nec se astrictum esse ad certam normam, quin hoc vel illo modo virtutem suam proferret . . . ita gratia Christi, quae in alios repente effusa prius erat, quasi guttatim defluxit in hunc hominem." We therefore differ from the view of EITREM, *Demonology*, p. 50, where he says that we must assume "that different methods are to be referred to different strata in Jesus' own healing ministry."

³ Cf. the opinion of VAN LEEUWEN, Markus: through the delayed action the sick man is obliged to pay more attention to his benefactor.

nipotence of His actions and His freedom in the method of treatment.

This man was also enjoined not to speak of his healing.¹ Jesus instructed him to go home and not even to go into the town. KEULERS infers from this that the man probably did not live in Bethsaida, but KLOSTERMANN's interpretation: do not (first) go into the town, is the most obvious one.²

(d) *The healing of the blind man or men at Jericho*

The story of the healing of the blind man or men at Jericho is given in Mt. 20 : 29-34, Mk. 10 : 46-52, and Lk. 18 : 35-43. A number of minor differences among the accounts cause few difficulties.³ Matthew differs considerably from Mark and Luke in his mention of two blind men, cf. his account of two demoniacs in the country of the Gergesenes, Mt. 8 : 28-34. In this case, too, all kinds of explanations have been given for this difference. The view that Matthew means another healing than the other two Evangelists do is far-fetched. A second supposition is that there were in fact two blind men, and Mark and Luke mentioned only the principal one.⁴ Since Luke places the healing at the beginning of the entry into

¹ EITREM, op. cit., p. 47, remarks with regard to this prohibition: "This instruction may certainly be referred to the Lord's conception of his Messianic office which he only later revealed to his disciples, as commentators generally interpret Jesus' conduct on such occasions. But at the same time it must be noticed that interdicts of this sort are, as said, conventional in the practice of folklore medicine. The complete recovery of the patient depends upon his seclusion from any detrimental influence of the surroundings, eventually—and, at that time most of all—from the intrusion of spirits."

² KEULERS, op. cit.; KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium* . . . The manuscripts give different versions here.

³ See KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 49, classifies the story under the paradigms "minder reinen Typs." BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 228, puts it among the "Wundergeschichten."

⁴ GODET, *Lukas*. KEULERS, *Mattheüs*: "the one blind man whose name Mark handed down was doubtless the better-known one." HAUCK, *Markus*: "Möglich dass sein Name deshalb genannt wird, weil er in der Urgemeinde eine bekannte Person war." GREYDANUS, *Lukas*, believes that Bartimaeus took the initiative, this being the reason why Mark and Luke mention him only. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 315, shares this view. According to BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 228, the naming of the name is proof that the account is secondary. Note the "novellistische" interest in giving unknown healed persons a name (the woman with an issue becomes Veronica, etc.). Consequently, one must be sceptical towards the name Bartimaeus (p. 256 f.). For Bultmann's view of the "couple" in Matthew, see the two demoniacs. According to DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 50, an anonymous blind man was later identified with a well-known blind man from Jericho.

Jericho and Matthew has it take place as the group is leaving the town, the possibility of two healings has been envisaged, one upon their entering the town and one upon their leaving it, which gives Matthew his two. The view that Matthew is here combining the account given in Mk. 10 with the healing at Bethsaida, Mk. 8 : 22-26, thus arriving at the number of two blind men, automatically gives rise to the question of what the position is with the two blind men in Mt. 9 : 27-31.

All attempts to bring the stories into line with one another are open to dispute, so that no satisfactory solution can be found for this matter, any more than for the two demoniacs.

The healing took place near Jericho. There was an Old and a New Jericho. Old Jericho was a tumbledown old town in Jesus' days, but the new part extending southwards was an attractive area in which Herod had built his winter palace and other edifices. FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS praises the beauty of the environs of Jericho.¹ DALMAN says that it may be imagined that the healing of the blind man took place before the southern entrance of the town, on the road where the traveller crosses the Jordan.² According to an investigation by Ketter, the miracle took place between Old and New Jericho; whilst Matthew and Mark are thinking of the Israelitic Old Jericho, Luke has in mind the New Jericho of Herod.³ The discrepancy about the place could be solved in that way.

Mark knows the name of the blind man: the man was the son of Timaeus, Bartimaeus, and was a beggar.⁴ Luke also says that the man was a beggar; according to Matthew "they" were sitting by the wayside.

When the unfortunate man learned — according to Luke he heard

¹ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS praises Jericho as the only place where the very valuable balsam is produced and where the finest date-palms grow in multitudes. See *Antiq.*, IV, VI, 1; XIV, IV, 1. *De bello Jud.*, I, VI, 6; IV, VIII, 3. Cf. SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, I and II, on the vicissitudes of Jericho; STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 177 ff.; KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 312 ff.

² DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 259.

³ See KEULERS, *Mattheüs*, who refers to P. Ketter, *Zur Lokalisierung der Blindenheilung bei Jericho*, *Biblica* 1934, pp. 411-418. Cf. PLUMMER, *St. Luke*; GREYDANUS, *Lukas*, leaves it at a non-liquet on account of the absence of sufficient data.

⁴ The meaning of Timaeus, תִּמְאִי is uncertain, cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 25. Is it an abbreviation of Timotheus? Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markus-evangelium*. CHAJES, *Markus-Studien*, p. 59 ff., considers the view correct that in *τιμαίος* merely the proper name תִּמְאִי must be seen.

the multitude pass by — that Jesus of Nazareth was passing, he cried out: "Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me," Mk. 10 : 47.¹

The pilgrims wanted none of this shouting and a possible delay. Was Jesus interrupted in His teaching, which He gave as they went on their way?² Did they fear that the title "Son of David" might now form a danger for Jesus, or was this cry considered premature, since they preferred to save the proclamation of the dignity of the Messiah until the entry into Jerusalem?³ The blind man later addressed Jesus solely as "Lord;"⁴ it is therefore questionable whether he himself had much conception of the title he used.⁵ The man continued to cry out and succeeded in drawing Jesus' attention to himself,⁶ whereupon He asked the blind man: "What wilt thou that I should do unto thee?" probably to test the belief of the blind man. Matthew tells us that Jesus, in answer to the prayer of the blind men that they might see, touched their eyes; in Mark and Luke the man regains his sight upon Jesus' saying that his faith has made him whole.⁷

The three Evangelists state that the healing was "immediate;" the

¹ Matthew 20 : 30: "Have mercy on us, O Lord, thou Son of David." Luke 18 : 38: "Jesus, thou Son of David, have mercy on me" . . . SCHNEIDER, TWNT, II, p. 679, remarks that Lk. 18 : 37, "Jesus of Nazareth passeth by," *παρέρχεται*, may also be interpreted: "als rein szenische Bemerkung." But it may also belong: "zum Erzählungsstil der Epiphanie." "Sie müsste dann als ein 'epiphanes Zeichen' verstanden werden, das in einem scheinbar zufälligen Augenblick die messianische Macht und Hoheit Jesu enthüllt" (this is how it is interpreted by E. Lohmeyer, "En Hij wilde hen voorbijgaan," in *Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift* 23 [1934], 206-224).

² PLUMMER, St. Luke.

³ GOULD, St. Mark.

⁴ ἰαββουί, Mk. 10 : 51; κύριε, Mt. 20 : 33 and Lk. 18 : 41 . . . For Rabboni see among others STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 25; DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 272 ff. LOHSE, TWNT, VI, p. 964 ff.

⁵ DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*: "Ansprüche auf Messias-Gläubigkeit will er damit nicht erheben." For the title "Son of David" see DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 260 ff.; VAN DER LOOS, *Jezus Messias-Koning*, p. 82 ff.

⁶ Mark gives a number of details: Jesus commands that the blind man be called, and those who do that bid him to be of good comfort. The blind man casts away his garment and goes to Jesus. PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 41, distinguishes four parts in Mark: (a) the blind man cries out and is reprimanded by the people; (b) the blind man cries out a second time and is called by Jesus; (c) the blind man approaches and is questioned by Jesus; (d) the prayer for healing and the word of healing.

⁷ Mark 10 : 52: "Go thy way; thy faith hath made thee whole." Luke 18 : 42: "Receive thy sight: thy faith hath saved thee" . . . PLUMMER, St. Luke: "The man's persistency is evidence of his faith, which Christ recognizes." VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*: "Jesus' word is a word with power that works where He finds faith."

healed man glorified God, Lk. 18 : 43, and followed Jesus on the road. "And all the people, when they saw it, gave praise unto God," Luke adds.

The text does not tell us whether we are concerned here with a man born blind or whether the man had earlier possessed the power of sight. MICKLEM believes that the man had definitely once been able to see. According to Mk. 10 : 50 he rose and came to Jesus; perhaps, then, he could still see a little! According to MICKLEM, we are therefore probably concerned with functional blindness.¹ FENNER again thinks that this was a case of hysteria.²

Against the background of events — Jesus is on His way to Jerusalem, to suffer and to die — this miraculous healing is of particular importance. The Synoptists all place it in the same frame.³ A striking point is that Jesus does not reject the title "Son of David;" His command that the blind man be called, Mk. 10 : 49, rather implies that He pays it particular attention. The healing of the blind man who then follows Jesus on the one hand manifests, without any concealment, the Messianic glory of Jesus and His pity on those who believe in Him, and on the other hand it characterizes the blindness of the people of Israel, whose eyes remain closed to this glory.⁴

(e) *The healing of the man born blind*

The account of the healing of the man born blind, Jn. 9 : 1-41, differs in many respects from the Synoptic accounts of the healing of the blind. At the very beginning of the story the case of the blind man is made a problem and a sign by the question of the disciples

¹ MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 105 ff. Micklem thinks that ἀναβλέπω (Mk. 10 : 51; Lk. 18 : 41, 42) must mean here to receive sight again. However, the verb can also simply mean to receive sight.

² FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 71.

³ See BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 156.

⁴ GREYDANUS, Lukas, puts forward the idea that Jesus went to Jericho deliberately to heal the blind man and for Zacchaeus, "and with a view to those multitudes which had to surround him upon his entry into Jerusalem." RENGSTORF, *Das NTD*, I, 2, p. 193: this healing contains: "ein erstes öffentliches Bekenntnis Jesu zu seinem messianischen Amt." HAUCK, Lukas: the healed man becomes a "Gegentyp" of the Jewish people who are soon to reject Jesus in Jerusalem; the same idea appears in HAUCK, Markus. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 307: the Evangelists changed Jesus' words of consolation to the blind man into a miracle, but Jesus, "having prepared himself to declare himself in Jerusalem publicly as the Messiah, saw in the blind beggar the forerunner of the coming revelation."

about the relation between sin and disease.¹ The healing itself leads to a wide discussion, in which all kinds of persons are concerned. The story begins with the statement that Jesus saw a man who had been blind from birth as He was passing by. Did this happen immediately after the attack on Jesus in the temple, Jn. 8 : 59, and in the vicinity of the temple, a favourite spot for beggars and other unfortunates, or did it happen later? It is impossible to say. In answer to the disciples' question: "who did sin, this man or his parents?," verse 2, Jesus said that the works of God should be made manifest in him, verse 3. The causally envisaged alternative of the disciples, child or parents, is rejected by Jesus and replaced by a third possibility, viz. that of the purpose: in the healing of this blind man both the glory of God and the salvation that He brings shall be revealed.² Before He performed the miracle, Jesus Himself thus pointed to the symbolic meaning thereof: because He is the light of the world, verse 5, the darkness must give way. The disciples are also involved in these works; while it is day, i.e. while they live, they must work, just as Jesus Himself does.³ "When he had thus spoken, he spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay," verse 6.⁴ Why did Jesus perform this complicated operation? IRENAEUS and others compare Gen. 2 : 7, the creation of man from the dust of the ground, with this deed by Jesus: the blind man received new eyes, made from clay.⁵ In their view, thus, the miracle was worked by the

¹ Cf. the section on the relation between disease and sin . . . DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 68, classifies Jn. 9 : 1 ff. among the "Novellen."

² Cf. Jn. 2 : 11 and 11 : 4 . . . BERTRAM, *TWNT*, II, p. 639. Jn. 9 : 3: "but that the works of God should be made manifest in him," is based on: "die Heilswirksamkeit Gottes im ganzen, die in der einzelnen Wundertat sich beispielhaft offenbart."

³ Jn. 9 : 4. Various texts have the version: ἐμὲ δεῖ, etc. Cf. BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 251 . . . DELLING, *TWNT*, II, p. 956: ἡμέρα is the "Lebenszeit" fixed by God. DELLING, *TWNT*, IV, p. 1119: Here νόξ is: "die Zeit mangelnder Wirkungsmöglichkeit, die mit dem Tode einsetzt." For the "limitation" of the time, see BARTH, *K.D.*, III, 4, p. 668; for the "must (δεῖ) work," III, 2, p. 406, cf. p. 66; for the work that the Son does as "the works of God" in His name, see III, 2, p. 73.

⁴ Cf. Mk. 8 : 23 . . . For the use of spittle see the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment.

⁵ IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, V, 15, 2: "Therefore the Lord [Christ] spat on the ground and made clay, and anointed it on the eyes [of the blind], to demonstrate how the ancient modelling had taken place and to make the hand of God known to those who were able to understand it, [the hand] by means of which man was shaped from clay." In others, e.g. Cyprian, Chrysostom, and also Beza,

creative force of Jesus; however, the text itself gives no single reason for extending the miracle. The lengths to which the rationalists can go to run down these matters is illustrated by a number of questions posed by PAULUS, which are worth mentioning. Was John there, and did he see that Jesus made the ointment for the eyes only from His spittle? "Was it perhaps coincidental that Jesus, whilst he was mixing from other ingredients the salve he smeared on the blind man's eyes, also spat, and the man born blind then thought that the salve was made from what Jesus spat out?" And did Jesus perhaps take something out of the eyes or brush it away, or make some other change?¹ STRAUSS tersely opposes this "unbridled" manner of exegesis.²

we likewise find the view that new eyes were formed from clay (*formatio oculorum e sputo*). THOMAS, III, qu. XLIV, art. III, concludes: "From his spittle he made clay, because the word has become flesh. Or also to show that it was he himself who had formed man from the clay of the earth, as Chrysostom says" (*De saliva sua lutum fecit, quia verbum caro factum est. Vel etiam ad significandum, quod ipse erat qui ex limo terrae hominem formaverat: ut Chrysost. dicit*). Cf. W. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 365; VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, II, p. 418. ARNOBIUS, *Adv. Gentes*, I, 45, in a eulogy on the miracles of Christ: the blind recovered their sight and people born without eyes now looked up to heaven and the daylight . . . Cf. the healing of a blind man by Emperor Vespasian, TACITUS, *Historiae*, IV, 81; SÜETONIUS, *Vespasianus*, VII; CASSIUS DIO, *Hist. Romana*, LXVI, 8. HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 25, miracle 40: Timon of X had been wounded under his eye by a lance. He slept in the temple: "he dreamed that the deity ground up a herbal medicine and poured it into his eye, and he was healed." Idem, p. 13, miracle 9: a man had an entirely empty eye. Some people in the temple laughed at him for his naivety in considering healing possible. He slept in the temple and "he dreamed that the deity had boiled a medicine, had then opened his eyelids and poured the medicine in." The next morning he was cured. RENGSTORF, *TWNT*, VI, p. 119, points to the use of the word *πηλός*, clay in regulations of the god Aesculapius in the first half of the second century. The sick had to wash themselves in holy places. "Im Gebrauch von *πηλός* J 9, 6 ff. könnte dann ein Zug vorliegen, mit dessen Hilfe der 4. Evangelist den von ihm verkündigten σωτήρ, Jesus, von dem 'Heiland' Asklepios absetzen möchte . . ." Cf. RENGSTORF, *Die Anfänge der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Christusglaube u. Asklepiosfrömmigkeit*, note 62, p. 39, on Aelius Aristides, who had to rub himself with *πηλός* in Pergamum and then wash it off. BARRETT, *St. John*, points to "an instructive parallel," mentioned in Dittenberger, *Syll.* 1173.15-18 (see Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East* p.132). This is probably a healing brought about by Aesculapius. The inscription, reads: "To Valerius Aper, a blind soldier, the god revealed that he should go (*ἐλθεῖν*, cf. v. 7, *ὑπαγε*) and take the blood of a white cock, together with honey, and rub them into an eyesalve (cf. the use made of clay and spittle, v. 6) and anoint (*ἐπιχρεῖσαι*, cf. v. 11) his eyes three days. And he received his sight (*ἀνέβλεψε*, cf. v. 11), and came (*ἐλήλυθεν*, cf. v. 7, *ἦλθεν*) and gave thanks publicly to the god." Cf. EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, p. 250 f.

¹ PAULUS, *Commentar über das Neue Testament*, IV, 1, p. 491.

² STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 78 ff. Cf. his cutting remark about the

Although a certain curative power is attributed to spittle, it is absolutely out of the question, medically speaking, that a mixture of spittle and clay could restore the sight of a man born blind. We must therefore abandon any idea that Jesus used the clay as a medicine or as the conductor of healing force.¹ The solution has also been sought in other directions, and in this search the one scholar proves to have more attention for the case as such, whilst the other immediately loses himself in symbolism.

JEREMIAS places the man in the centre: Jesus' aim was pedagogic and psychological, viz. the idea had to be aroused in the blind man that Jesus wanted to heal him. The treatment with the clay served as a means of arousing belief, just as going to the pool of Siloam was a means of testing the man.² According to KEULERS Jesus probably wished only to put the blind man to the test.³ BRANDT believes that Jesus was guided by feelings of mercy and prudence; anointing the man's eyes with clay gave him an opportunity to prepare himself for healing.⁴ If it is assumed that behind Jesus' action there lay in the first place a deeper spiritual truth in the sense of "he who will see must first become blind" or something similar, then one might say that the eyes of the man born blind were only

rationalists. The Evangelist Mark, for instance, speaks only of spittle: "das wirksame Pulver aber streuen Paulus und Venturini darein . . .," p. 73.

¹ Cf. SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 19, re Jn. Jn. 9: "Ich glaube nicht, dass man mit unseren heutigen medizinischen Vorstellungen diesen Fall aufklären kann, es sei denn, man geht der Frage mit symbolischer Deutung nach psychoanalytischer oder anthroposophischer Methode zuleibe. Und dies möchte ich, so verlockend es auch oft ist, vermeiden. Es würde ins Uferlose gehen." CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Jn. 9 : 7. Neither the clay nor the water of Siloam contained any healing force (*Neque in luto neque in aqua Siloae quicquam ad sanandos oculos fuisse virtutis certum est*). Christ often adorned His miracles by external means, either to accustom the faithful to the use of signs, or to prove that everything is subject to His will, or to bear witness that there is as much power in every creature as He Himself wishes to give (*Sed Christus libere externis istis symbolis sua miracula non semel ornavit, sive ut fideles assuefaceret ad signorum usum, sive ut ostenderet suo arbitrio subesse omnia, sive ut testatum faceret tantum esse potentiae in singulis creaturis quantum ipse dare velit*).

² JEREMIAS, *Babylonisches im N.T.*, p. 108: "Es soll Glauben wecken wie der Gang zum Siloah-Teich den Glauben erproben soll. Dabei kam der Umstand zu Hilfe, dass der Blinde die Volksweisheit kannte: im Speichel liegt Heilkraft. Ebenso wusste er: das Wasser des Siloah gilt als heilkräftig."

³ KEULERS, *Joannes*.

⁴ BRANDT, *Das ewige Wort*, re Jn. 9 : 1 ff.: "Diese schonende und zum Gehorsam und zur eigenen Aktivität rufende Art der Heilung bedeutet in diesem besonderen Fall grösste Barmherzigkeit Jesu."

the showground used to demonstrate the spiritual enlightenment or a theological view.

CALVIN rightly rejects the idea that the clay represents the earthly nature of Christ and the spittle from His mouth the divine essence of the word.¹ But we are not greatly helped by the opinion which Calvin himself holds, viz. that Jesus, by anointing the man's eyes with clay, perhaps wanted to show that it was no more difficult for Him to open the eyes of a blind man than it is for any man to wipe away clay, and that Jesus was capable of preserving a man's sight as if someone had smeared the eyes with clay.² To sum up, we may say that there is a choice of solutions explaining Jesus' method: encouragement, reassurance, awakening hope and belief, testing or deepening belief, manifestation of Jesus' omnipotence. The following may be said with more or less certainty:

- (a) the laying on of hands and the use of spittle must be regarded here, as elsewhere, against the background of the then methods of healing. As we have already said, there is no question of a "medicine."
- (b) No definite answer can be given to the question why Jesus acted as He did in this case. After further consideration of the series of solutions mentioned above, the fact remains that Jesus could also have achieved the same purpose in another way. Most of these explanations are therefore more born of the "Christian consciousness" (Strauss) than determined by the facts themselves. It is rather difficult to speak of testing faith, since faith was not the issue.
- (c) The purpose of the laying on of hands was to make the man realize that something important was happening to him, as a result of which all kinds of emotions and expectations were understandably aroused.

We believe that, whilst a wide variety of theological and symbolic speculations may lead even to surprising views, there is a risk that this will result in a dangerously rapid departure from historical fact.

Anointment with the clay was the first phase. The man was still

¹ CALVIN, *op. cit.*, re Jn. 9 : 7: "Quaerunt tamen nonnulli quid lutum ex pulvere et sputo compositum significet, et hanc fuisse Christi figuram interpretantur: quia pulvis terrenam carnis naturam, sputum autem ex ore profectum, divinam verbi essentiam notet."

² CALVIN, *op. cit.*, re Jn. 9 : 7: "... vel forte hoc signo testatum voluit, sibi non esse difficilius discusso impedimento aperire caeci oculos, quam hominum cuiusvis lutum abstergere: rursum suae esse potestatis tenere hominis visum, perinde acsi quis oculos luto illinat. quod posterius mihi magis aridet."

blind. When Jesus said: "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam," the man went, washed himself, and returned with his sight restored, verse 7. The name Siloam was connected with the underground canal which had been excavated under the rule of King Hezekiah,¹ and which carried the water from the spring of Gihon, now Mary's spring, to the south-east corner of the old Jerusalem, where it emptied into a large reservoir, the pool of Siloah.² The addition: "which is by interpretation, Sent" has become fertile soil for symbolism.³ Why did John add this?⁴ This passage is fairly generally related to the person of Jesus Christ. John repeatedly says that Jesus was "sent" by the Father.⁵ Well then, why should the pool of Siloam not be the symbol of Christ, from whom we receive life and light? Is He not the true Siloam? One step further and not only the name of the water in which the man bathed, but also the water of the pool, was brought into the symbolism: the water of the pool is characteristic of baptismal water! For baptism is also "enlightenment."⁶ A feeling for deeper interpretation of Scripture is certainly praiseworthy in some respects, but the relation between the water from the pool by means of which the man washed the clay out of his eyes — cannot someone distil a self-baptism out of this as well? — and baptismal water is an absolute mystery to us. An opinion does not necessarily involve a relation! But one should be doubly on one's guard when the

¹ 2 Ki. 20 : 20; 2 Ch. 32 : 30. Cf. Sir. 48 : 17; for Isaiah 8 : 6, "the waters of Shiloah that go softly," see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 532. The meaning is probably the Siloah spring or other pools in the Cedron valley. GROLLENBERG and VAN DEURSEN, *Atlas van de Bijbel*, p. 93 f. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 371 ff.

² Cf. Lk. 13 : 4. See the lengthy description in DALMAN, *Jerusalem u. sein Gelände*; idem, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 327; STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 530 ff. PREUSS, *op. cit.*, the chapter entitled "Waschungen und Bäder," also draws attention to the fact that the priests, after eating an excess of sacrificial meat, drank "Siloa-wasser." "Dieses wäre also eine und, soweit ich sehe, die einzige Nachricht aus der talmudischen Literatur über den zielbewussten innerlichen Gebrauch eines Mineralwassers zu arzneilichem Zweck" (p. 626). Preuss refers to Aboth RN 35, 5.

³ Jn. 9 : 7, Σιλωάμ ὁ ἑρμενεύεται ἀπεσταλμένος. שִׁלּוֹם can, depending on whether it is vocalized, mean "to send" (שִׁלַּח, infinitive, emissio aquae = water conduit) or "that which is sent" (שִׁלּוּחַ, participle, aqua emissa). STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 530.

⁴ BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, thinks of an addition by an editor.

⁵ ἀποστέλλω, see Mt. 15 : 24; Mk. 9 : 37; Lk. 9 : 48; Jn. 3 : 17, 34; 5 : 36, 38; 6 : 29, 57; 7 : 29; 8 : 42; 11 : 42; 17 : 3, 8, 21, 23, 25; 20 : 21.

⁶ KEULERS, Joannes: "Obviously John thought of baptism; for Jesus brings about the healing through the water of the pool." WILKINS, *op. cit.*, p. 54 f.

text allows of other explanations as well. For, although Jesus' being "sent" is a basic idea in the fourth Gospel, the word Siloam here does not necessarily have to refer to Jesus, but could relate just as well to the blind man, who was "sent" to the pool. Or perhaps John only wanted to make an allusion to Isa. 8 : 6, in which it is stated that Israel: "refuseth the waters of Shiloah that go softly." His readers may then interpret the addition as meaning that, just as Israel had once been mistaken about the force and the significance of the quiet waters of Siloah, and was impressed by the mighty river Euphrates as a symbol of Eastern world power, so the Jews were now incredulous of Jesus Christ's quiet methods.¹

However, it seems to us that all this groping about in symbolism leads to no other result than to a departure from the text, whilst there is a simple and obvious solution. If we study John's style, we note that he has a certain liking for further definitions and additions where references are concerned. He likes to mention important and sometimes unimportant items incidental to the story, or to accommodate the reader by a translation into or from Hebrew.² Now when the words: "Siloam, (which is by interpretation, Sent)" are compared with Jn. 20 : 16: "Rabboni; which is to say, Master," it is in our opinion obvious that in each case the Evangelist had one and the same intention, viz. further to inform his readers about the word in question. In other words, in Jn. 9 : 7 there is no question of symbolism, but of a certain stylistic form.

The part of John 9 which then follows contains the discussions around this miracle. It is not necessary within the scope of our investigation to follow these discussions closely; we shall merely stress a number of points. The healed blind man told the doubting neighbours and acquaintances in a few words how everything had

¹ Cf. BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 253, note 3: "Möglich, dass der Evglst angesichts des Unglaubens der Juden an Jesaja 8, 6 denkt."

² Jn. 3 : 23: "in Aenon near to Salim, because there was much water there;" 4 : 5: "Sychar, near to the parcel of ground that Jacob gave to his son Joseph;" 4 : 46: "Cana of Galilee, where he made the water wine;" 5 : 2: "a pool, which is called in the Hebrew tongue Bethesda;" 11 : 1: "Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha;" 19 : 13: "the Pavement, but in the Hebrew, Gabbatha;" 19 : 17: "the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha." DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 452, believes that the topographical details do not have any symbolic significance, possibly with the exception of Siloam. "Siloam, it is true, is given a symbolical meaning; but that marks it out as an exception." Cf. p. 357: the water enlightens only if it is the truly "Sent," the Son whom the Father sends.

happened, verses 8-12. BULTMANN sees in this a "prelude" to the discussion with the Pharisees: "in the distraction of these people the embarrassment of the authorities is already reflected."¹ BULTMANN regards the account from the point of view of form, style and topic, but where is there any question of distraction in the text? The account speaks of nothing more than doubt and curiosity; in it a situation is sketched true to life in the spirit of: "How can that be? Is it really him?," as occurs every day and everywhere. The doubt and the curiosity oust the acclamation that otherwise often followed. The words "A man that is called Jesus," verse 11, strike one as rather matter-of-fact and strange. The man is taken to the Pharisees, i.e. not to the Sanhedrin — it is not stated by whom, when and for what purpose: to accuse Jesus or to obtain the Pharisees' verdict? — and in the discussion that now ensues, verses 13-17, the question of the Sabbath is brought up. The healing had taken place on a Sabbath, and, according to the prevailing opinion, Jesus had broken the Sabbath, since eye diseases were also covered by the rule that in an acute and dangerous case treatment might be given on the Sabbath, but chronic diseases had to wait.² The Pharisees tried to solve the difference of opinion which had arisen in their midst about the person of Jesus by once again asking the blind man what he thought about Jesus, whereupon the blind man answered: "He is a prophet."³ This reveals an increasing estimation: "a man that is called Jesus" has become "prophet." The talk with the healed man's parents, verses 18-23, yielded no results for the Pharisees either. The Jews tried to nullify the miracle, but the parents, for all their caution, could do no more than state that their son, born blind, could now see. But their son was of age; let him speak for himself!⁴ For the parents feared banishment from the synagogue.⁵ During a second questioning

¹ BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 253.

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 530, 533 f. The body might be anointed on the Sabbath with the same salves as on weekdays. Other unguents were regarded as medicines and forbidden.

³ Cf. Jn. 4 : 19 . . . DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 79 f., goes in detail into the procedure before the "tribunal" of the Pharisees.

⁴ The man was of age, i.e. older than 13 years and 1 day. Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 534, cf. p. 144 ff. SCHNEIDER, *TWNT*, II, p. 943 ff.

⁵ Cf. Jn. 12 : 42; 16 : 2 and Lk. 6 : 22. The Jews had (a) banishment for thirty days, known as minor banishment, *יָדַי* or *שְׁמַתָּא*; (b) major banishment, *חֲרִיף*, for an indefinite period. A reprimand, *נִיפָה*, ranked as a kind of "Vorstufe" of banishment. See SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, II, p. 434 ff.; STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1 p. 293 ff. BARRETT, *St. John*, doubts whether the ordinary

of the healed man, verses 24-34, the contrast manifested itself more sharply, and the man was even reviled, verse 28. The development of the questioning is noteworthy: first the healed man is ordered to give "God the praise," which according to DODD means that the man had to tell the full truth, and, with them, to declare Jesus a sinner, verse 24. Then the Pharisees again wanted to know exactly what had really happened, verse 26, the idea perhaps being to trap the man into contradicting himself. After the shrewd counterquestion of the healed man: "will ye also be his disciples?," the complete antithesis comes to light in the answer: "Thou art his disciple; but we are Moses' disciples," verse 28. They, the rabbis, recognized only one teacher, Moses, on whom all tradition rested.¹ That is why they are so fiercely opposed to Jesus' "high-handed" action, an opposition which grew into deadly enmity.² FASCHER therefore considers that the heart of the story lies in this answer by the Pharisees. According to FASCHER the Evangelist incorporated a miracle story, but as we read it nowadays it contains the description of the struggle between the disciples of Jesus and those of Moses.³ As the proceedings continued the healed man began to take sides more courageously and vigorously with his benefactor, who, if He were not of God, verse 33, could have done nothing. This brought down the wrath of his judges upon him.⁴ Finally he was cast out, either from the meeting, or in fact excommunicated.⁵ In the course of the conversation which Jesus had with the man after he had been cast out, verses 35-39, the latter acquired full understanding. "Dost thou believe

excommunication from the synagogue is meant here. He refers to the prayer (*ברכת המינים*, the "Heretic Benediction"), in which the downfall of the Nazarenes and the heretics (*minim*) was prayed for. "The Benediction was probably intended as a means of marking out Jewish Christians and excluding them from the synagogue community" See also SCHRAGE, TWNT, VII, p. 846 ff. As regards the "confessing," Jn. 9 : 22, see MICHEL, TWNT, V, p. 208.

¹ See RENGSTORF, TWNT, IV, p. 439: "Das rabbinische Spätjudentum erweist sich als bewusster 'Mosaismus'."

² See RENGSTORF, TWNT, IV, p. 446; idem, II, 159 . . . Cf. W. G. KÜMMEL, Jesus u. der jüdische Traditionsgedanke. "Jeder Lehrsatz der Tradition ist im Torabuch angedeutet" (p. 114). Hence the issue for the Pharisees was either the tradition, or Jesus. "Dieses Entweder-Oder, das Jesus den Pharisäern stellte, hat Jesus den Tod gebracht," p. 130.

³ FASCHER, op. cit., p. 178 f.

⁴ With reference to Jn. 9 : 31, a worshipper of God (*θεοσεβής*), see BERTRAM, TWNT, III, p. 126: "In J 9, 31 ist die Eigenschaft der Gottesfurcht als Voraussetzung für die Erhöhung durch Gott festgestellt . . ." Cf. Pro. 15 : 29.

⁵ Cf. 3 Jn, verse 10. BULTMANN, Das Evangelium des Johannes, p. 255, note 5.

on the Son of God?," Jesus asked him.¹ Opinions may differ about what Jesus exactly meant by this question,² but there is no doubt that Jesus wanted to guide the man to knowledge of the full truth, viz. that He, Jesus, who had given sight to the man born blind, was the promised Redeemer of Israel. The chapter ends with a short dispute between Jesus and a number of Pharisees who were with Him, verses 40-41. The delusion of the Pharisees that they "saw" held them captive in blindness and sin.³

Both the content and the form of the account offer the clearest possible proof of the fact that we are not concerned with an official report of the event and of the questionings. The whole story is part of the personal testimony of Jesus that He is the light of the world. The gradual development of the blind man towards full understanding, the increasing enmity of the Jews, etc., prove that the author's own thoughts also have their say here. But this does not mean that the healing of the man born blind is also part of these thoughts. There is not a single reason to doubt the reliability of the account of the healing as such.⁴

¹ BARRETT, St. John, says that "the Son of man" (ΝΒD sin) is to be preferred to "the Son of God." Cf. Nestle, Nov. Test. Gr. . . . BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 261 ff., points out that this story runs: "äusserlich gerade umgekehrt" to Mt. 9 : 27 ff. Note the trend of development: verses 3 - 11 - 17 - 25 - 31 - 33. The man seems at first to be more of an object than a subject. This changes from verse 35 onwards. There was not a "hidden faith" already present in the healed man beforehand: "wohl aber dessen reale Voraussetzung: wer und was Jesus für ihn und also wer und was er selbst für Jesus schon war." In the final conversation Jesus then opens for him "auch die Augen des Glaubens," verse 37. RENGSTORF, TWNT, VII, p. 249 ff., the relation between σημεῖον and πίστις.

² See BULTMANN, Das Evangelium des Johannes, p. 256 f. KEULERS, Joannes. BARRETT, op. cit. "σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; The pronoun is emphatic: Do *you*, over against those who have expelled you, believe?"

³ With reference to Jn. 9 : 39, εἰς κρίμα, see BÜCHSEL, TWNT, III, p. 943. "κρίμα bezeichnet die Entscheidung des Richters," meant here as "Handlung." . . . BARTH, K.D., III, 2, p. 70: "Zum Gericht, zum κρίμα bin ich in diese Welt gekommen, sagt Jesus Joh. 9, 39 auf dem Höhepunkt der Geschichte von der Heilung und vom Glaubensbekenntnis des Blindgeborenen. Wer steht da zur Rechten und wer zur Linken des Richters? Hier die Guten, dort die Bösen? Nein, sondern hier die Nichtsehenden, die sehen, dort die Sehenden, die blind werden! die Sünder als die Berufenen—die Gerechten als die Nichtberufenen (Matth. 9, 13), so scheiden sich an Jesus die Geister".

⁴ MICHAELIS, Einleitung in das NT, p. 112: "In der Verbindung von Augenzeugenbericht und Deutung liegt das Geheimnis der Andersartigkeit des Joh.-Ev. im Vergleich mit den Syn." Cf. KOOLE, De opvatting van Johannes, in Waszink et al., "Het oudste Christendom en de antieke Cultuur," II, p. 209 ff.

III. THE HEALING OF THE PARALYTICS

(a) *Introduction*

The Gospels contain a number of references to the healing of paralytics. Elsewhere, too, we find stories about such healings.

The Old Testament speaks several times about paralysed limbs, and it is worthy of note that both men and animals were regarded as unsuitable for the cult if they were paralysed.¹ Otherwise paralytics were treated with kindness.² Like the blind and the deaf, the lame were also to share in the joy of the aeon of salvation.³

In the literature of Antiquity we find many a story about the healing of paralytics. The god Aesculapius healed paralysed fingers;⁴ the whole body;⁵ knees;⁶ and legs.⁷ HERZOG believes that we must regard these chiefly as functional disturbances.⁸ Emperor Vespasian

¹ One of the provisions of the sanctification laws for the priests was that a blind man, עִוְר, or a paralytic, חֲסִיד, could not hold priestly office, any more than other physically defective persons, Lev. 21 : 18. A lame, חֲסִיד, or blind animal could not be sacrificed, Deu. 15 : 21; cf. Mal. 1 : 8, 13. The offering had to be without "blemish," מִמִּנְחָה, cf. Lev. 22 : 17-25. The lame were therefore in a difficult position in this respect, too; cf. also 2 Sa. 5 : 8.

² Mephibosheth, who was lame in both feet, was allowed to eat at "the king's table," 2 Sa. 9 : 13. Cf. 2 Sa. 19 : 28.

³ Isa. 35 : 6: "then shall the lame man leap as an hart." Cf. also Jer. 31 : 8 . . . PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, gives a detailed survey of "Der Lahme" (pp. 266-270). The pisseach is called "chigger" in the Talmud. "Auch der chigger ist also ein Gelähmter; der Wortbedeutung nach ein Gebundener, dem Sinne nach ein Gelöster, παραλυτικός" (p. 267) . . . On pp. 351-355 Preuss discusses the "Lähmungen."

⁴ HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 9, miracle 3: a man could use only one of his fingers; they were "powerless" (ἀκρατεῖς), but were healed.

⁵ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 15, miracle 15: the man was powerless of body; ἀκρατῆς τοῦ σώματος . . . Miracle 16: Nicanor was lame, χωλός, and recovered when a boy stole his stick: he ran after him . . . Cf. also p. 23, miracle 35; p. 24 ff., miracle 37; p. 31, miracle 57.

⁶ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 25, miracle 38.

⁷ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 33, miracle 64. Demosthenes of X, whose legs were paralysed, had to stay four months in the temple to recover . . . Propertius, *Elegiae*, II, 1, 59: "Machaon healed the lame feet of Philoctetes" (Tarda Philoctetæ sanavit crura Machaon). See EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, p. 85 . . . Machaon and Podalirius, "sons" of Aesculapius, were good physicians; see Homer, *Iliad*.

⁸ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 98: "Diese Gruppe meist neurogener Funktionsstörungen ist in Epidauros wie in den christlichen Gnadenorten stark vertreten, da sie der Affektheilung besonders leicht zugänglich ist."

is credited with the healing of a paralytic in Alexandria.¹ Wise men of India, whom Apollonius of Tyana met on his travels, were capable of healing cripples and paralytics.²

In the New Testament the healing of paralytics is reported both in the lists of various diseases which were healed by Jesus and in a number of special cases.³

(b) *The man with the withered hand*

The Synoptists refer to the healing of the man with the withered hand.⁴ The healing took place on a Sabbath, and the conflict about the admissibility of the healing dominates the story.⁵ In all probability the healing was performed in the synagogue at Capernaum.⁶ The presence of the unfortunate man gave the opponents of Jesus

¹ TACITUS, Hist., IV, 81; SÜETONIUS, Vespasianus, VII. See the translation of the passage concerned in the chapter: Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels.

² VITA APOLL., III, 39: "Then came forward a cripple about thirty years old, who had been a very bold lion-hunter, but by the charge of a lion his hip had been dislocated so that one leg was shorter than the other. By stroking the hip with their hands the Sages restored to the young man the ability to walk naturally. Another, whose eyes had flowed out, went away with the sight fully recovered: and another who had a paralysed hand left their presence cured" (transl. Eells).

³ The word *χωλός*, claudus, lame, paralysed, halt, occurs in Mt. 11 : 5; 15 : 30, 31; 21 : 14; Lk. 7 : 22; 14 : 13, 21; Jn. 5 : 3; Ac. 3 : 2; 8 : 7; 14 : 8. Cf. the imagery in Mt. 18 : 8; Mk. 9 : 45; He. 12 : 13. The word *παραλυτικός*, paralyticus, sick of the palsy, etc., is used in Mt. 4 : 24; 8 : 6; 9 : 2, 6; Mk. 2 : 3 ff. Lk. 5 : 18 ff. speaks of a *παραλελυμένος*, paralyticus. Cf. Ac. 8 : 7; He. 12 : 12. The word *κωλός*, claudus, maimed, occurs in Mt. 15 : 30, 31, and metaphorically in Mt. 18 : 8; Mk. 9 : 43.

⁴ Mt. 12 : 9-14; Mk. 3 : 1-6; Lk. 6 : 6-11. DIBELIUS, Die Formgeschichte, p. 40, classifies the story among the paradigms; BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 9, among the apophthegms (Streit- und Schulgespräche) . . . SMITH, Ecce Deus, p. 34: "Einer der klarsten Fälle von Symbolik findet sich in der Heilung der vertrockneten Hand am Sabbath in der Synagoge. Offenbar ist der Mann das jüdische Volk, das vom Buchstaben des jüdischen Gesetzes und der Überlieferung gelähmt ist, aber zu Kraft und Macht zum Guten wieder hergestellt wird durch den befreienden Jesuskult."

⁵ See the section on Healing and the Sabbath. It could be derived from Mt. 12 : 9 that there is a close link with the preceding account. Mk. 3 : 1 inserts *πάλιν*, again, a favourite word of Mark's, which he uses 26 times, whilst Lk. 6 : 6 speaks of "another sabbath."

⁶ DALMAN, Orte u. Wege, p. 162 f.: "Es wird . . . berechtigt sein, wenn wir die Synagoge von tell-hūm, deren Wiederaufbau hoffentlich nicht versucht wird, für den Neubau derjenigen halten, in welcher Jesus einen Besessenen heilte (Markus 1, 21 ff.; Luk. 4, 31 ff.) und den kraftlosen Arm eines anderen zurechtbrachte (Matth. 12, 9 ff.; Mark. 3, 1 ff.; Luk. 6, 6 ff.)."

an opportunity to put before Him a problem concerning the correct observance of the Sabbath.¹

Mark and Luke introduce a certain suspense into their story, owing to the fact that Jesus has the man stand in their "midst." Whilst Matthew has Jesus use the example of a sheep that has fallen into a pit on the Sabbath, in Mark and Luke the question put by Jesus concentrates on the heart of the problem, viz. on the doing of good or of evil, saving life or killing on the Sabbath. The example cited by Matthew must bring it home to those present that it is a good deed to heal a human being, who is far superior to an animal, on the Sabbath. Observance in this matter was both strict and lenient; in the days of Jesus the lenient observance was more usual.² There were also differing views on the doing of good on the Sabbath. The school of Shammai was more strict than that of Hillel.³ Only Mark describes the attitude adopted by Jesus' opponents: "they held their peace." Matthew, whose description is the least vivid, says nothing at all about Jesus' reaction. On the other hand, Mark

¹ Mt. 12 : 10 says that "they asked him," ἐπερωτάω; Mk. 3 : 2 and Lk. 6 : 7 speak only of the "watching" of Jesus, παρατηρέω, whilst Luke names the watchers, viz. the Pharisees and the scribes. In all three cases an accusation is mentioned.

² Shabbath 128b: "Rab Judah said in Rab's name: If an animal falls into a dyke, one brings pillows and bedding and places [them] under it, and if it ascends it ascends. An objection is raised: If an animal falls into a dyke, provisions are made for it where it lies so that it should not perish. Thus, only provisions, but not pillows and bedding? . . . There is no difficulty: here it means where provisions are possible; there, where provisions are impossible. If provisions are possible, well and good¹), but if not, one brings pillows and bedding and places them under it" (ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman).

BISHOP, *Jesus of Palestine*, p. 111, remarks that "the vivid challenging way in which Jesus put the question of what Sabbath observance really meant is reminiscent of Palestinian psychology. The Semitic mind demands clear-cut decisions. There is no debating the point as the west sees debates. There are no middle terms between 'doing good' and 'doing evil,' between 'saving a life' and 'destroying it.' The choice is absolute. There is no such thing as compromise. The idea and the word are wanting in Arabic." As a good son of Palestine Jesus gave His opponents "the option of one thing or the other with no loophole to the startling alternative."

³ Shabbath 12a: "And R. Simeon b. Eleazar said likewise on the authority of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel: . . . nor may mourners be comforted, nor may the sick be visited on the Sabbath²): that is the ruling of Beth Shammai; but Beth Hillel permit it" (ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman).

There was also a difference of opinion about praying for a sick person on the Sabbath, helping a sick person on the Sabbath, etc.

¹) Lit., 'Yes.'

²) Both are too sad for the Sabbath.

makes a striking comment: "And when he had looked round about on them with anger, being grieved for the hardness of their hearts. . .," Mk. 3 : 5.¹ The command: "Stretch forth thine hand" — handed down by all the Synoptists in almost identical wording — was obeyed by the sick man, whereupon he recovered the use of his hand. The consequence of the healing was neither surprise nor acclamation, but increasing enmity.

Tradition contains further information on the healed man. Hieronymus writes in his commentary on Matthew that it is stated in the gospel used by the Nazarenes and Ebionites that the man approached Jesus with the words: "I was a mason, which earned his bread with his hands. I beg thee, Jesus, to restore to me my health, so that I need not beg for food in shameful fashion."² Luke states that it was the man's right hand. Was he an artisan? GREYDANUS is of the opinion that: "This was doubtless an 'ordinary' man of humble birth. A man of standing might perhaps not have allowed himself so to be ordered about, and would possibly not have permitted himself so to be exposed to the public gaze."³ This argument does not hold water. Just as it is impossible to diagnose the symptoms of the persons referred to elsewhere as suffering from "palsy," so it is impossible here.⁴ A small difference in description might possibly convey something about the duration of the complaint. Matthew speaks of a man "which had his hand withered."⁵ Mark says: "which had a withered hand."⁶ Luke says: "whose right hand was withered."⁷

¹ Cf. the more moderate: "And looking round about upon them all, he said . . ." Lk. 6 : 10.

² "In evangelio quo utuntur Nazareni et Ebionitae . . . homo iste qui aridam habet manum caementarius scribitur, istiusmodi vocibus auxilium precans, Caementarius eram, manibus victum quaeritans: precor te, Jesu, ut mihi restituas sanitatem, ne turpiter mendicem cibos." See PLUMMER, St. Luke. Cf. BAUER, Das Leben Jesu, p. 367, for the various views on this tradition.

³ GREYDANUS, Lukas, cf. HAUCK, Lukas.

⁴ PINKHOF, Geneeskundig woordenboek, calls paralysis: "the loss of the capacity to move a part of the body, a muscle or a group of muscles." He lists a large number of symptoms. PREUSS, op. cit., p. 351: "Über die παραλυτικοί des Neuen Testaments existiert bereits eine ganze Literatur. Die Autoren haben sich zum grossen Teil die Arbeit dadurch erschwert, dass sie unter diesen 'Paralytischen' entweder Paralytiker oder Gelähmte im ärztlich-klinischen Sinne verstanden, während die Paralyse der Alten jede Art von erheblicher Bewegungsstörung umfasst."

⁵ Mt. 12 : 10, χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν; manum habens aridam. ξηρός, withered, stiff, as adjective.

⁶ Mk. 3 : 1, ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων τὴν χεῖρα; habens manum aridam. Participle.

⁷ Lk. 6 : 6, καὶ ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ἡ δεξιὰ ἦν ξηρά.

Some scholars surmise that Mark wanted to convey the idea that the man did not have an innate defect, but was suffering from some disease.¹ However, nothing can be said with certainty, so that we cannot form any idea of what was exactly meant by that withered hand.² It is just as possible, though not likely, that the hand was used here as a *pars pro toto* for the arm, but one can with equal ease "stretch forth" one's arm instead of one's hand, as Jesus commanded the man to do.

Although the symptoms are so uncertain, various suppositions have nevertheless been voiced concerning the cause of the paralysis. EBSTEIN says that no diagnosis can be given, and suggests a nutritive disorder of the hand.³ SENG and MICKLEM suspect that mental influences lie behind the paralysis.⁴ FENNER seeks the cause in hysteria.⁵ These are all no more than hypotheses.

¹ GOULD, St. Mark; VAN LEEUWEN, Markus. SCHNIEWIND, Das NTD, I, 1, p. 63: "eine Abmagerung, die aus einem chronischen Leiden stammt." HERZOG, op. cit., p. 138, points to miracle 60, where it is said of Anaxagoras of X that the withered leg became alive, it budded again (τὸ σκέλος τὸ ξηρὸν ἀνέθαλε)... It may be derived from this that the course of the disease was regarded as withering.

² In 1 Ki. 13 : 4 the Septuagint translates the Hebrew יָבֹשׁ (i.e. dry up, harden) by the same word employed in the New Testament, viz. ξηραίνω, i.e. make dry, harden, cause to wither; passive: become dry, withered. It applies in the first place to trees and plants, which can "wither," and also to the human body, which can "dry up, wither." ξηρός = dry, withered, rigid. According to PREUSS, Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin, p. 354, there is a difference between the disease of the man in Mt. 12 : 9-14 and the case of Jeroboam, 1 Ki. 13 : 4. As regards the latter case, Preuss asks: "Hat es sich dabei um eine Subluxation gehandelt?"... This story is a striking illustration of the fact that people think first of themselves: Jeroboam has thought only for his hand, which has "dried up," perhaps as a result of subluxation (incomplete dislocation), whilst not a word is said about the "rent altar"!

³ EBSTEIN, Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud, p. 101: "In erster Reihe würde man wohl im vorliegenden Falle daran denken dürfen, dass es sich um einen Menschen handelte, dessen Hand aus irgendeinem die Heilung nicht ausschliessenden Grunde eine Ernährungsstörung erlitten hatte, welche in absehbarer Zeit wieder rückgängig geworden ist, wie das z.B. bei Ernährungsstörungen infolge von Neuritiden erfahrungsgemäss vorkommt."

⁴ SENG, Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung, p. 17: "Bei dem Mann mit der 'verdorrtten Hand' denken wir sofort an die Fälle von Lähmung einer Gliedmasse durch psychische Ursachen, wie wir sie massenhaft im Kriege zu sehen bekommen haben. Im Neuen Testament (Mark 3, 1) steht nichts über die Entstehung des Zustandes, so wenig wie in allen anderen Fällen. Medizinisch betrachtet werden wir geneigt sein, auch hier an die Heilung eines psychisch entstandenen Falles zu denken." MICKLEM, Miracles and the New Psychology, p. 95: "If we are going to give any meaning at all to 'withered,' we must understand at least some degree of wasting in the hand." According to Micklem, it may have been functional paralysis.

⁵ FENNER, Die Krankheit im N.T., p. 58: "Es liegt demnach eine mono-

We have already discussed this healing in another context. For the fact that Jesus' opponents were kept in suspense as to whether Jesus would heal on the Sabbath does not only mean that the Pharisees were "obviously convinced" of Jesus' power to heal;¹ it also points to the fact that they did not regard this power as Messianic power par excellence, but as a power that Jesus shared with others, which was not, however, exercised on the Sabbath.²

Although the Sabbath conflict comes strongly to the fore in this case, it would be an incorrect interpretation if the healing were to be regarded as an attendant circumstance, as a subsidiary matter. The point at issue is "doing good" on the Sabbath in concreto; the man in question was blessed in the full sense of the word by Jesus' benefaction. The event became at the same time a sign of the true observance and joy of the Sabbath.

(c) *The paralytic at Capernaum*

The healing of the paralytic at Capernaum is treated in fairly considerable detail by the Synoptists.³ Mark gives the most vivid description. Matthew states that Jesus had come into His "own

phlegische Lähmung mit Atrophieerscheinungen vor." This occurs in hysteria. Cf. HAGGARD, *Van medicijnman tot geneesheer*, p. 202, who states that paralysis of a leg and lameness are among the common symptoms of hysteria. The leg or the foot may display an abnormal position, perhaps contracture, or hang down limply. Paralysis may also occur under the stress of violent emotions (p. 200). PREUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 352, says about the "explanation" of these healings: "Sie werden, wie bekannt, durch Jesu Wort geheilt, wobei viele der neutestamentlichen Ausleger an suggestiv Beeinflussung gedacht haben. Diese 'Paralytiker' wären dann also Hysterische oder Aggravanten gewesen." PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, II, p. 53, says that there is no reason to think of an atrophied hand: "wenn man nicht zuerst die Krankheit unheilbar machen will, um alsdann die Heilung unbegreiflich zu finden" . . . See further the chapter: *Miracles and Medicine*.

¹ VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*.

² Cf. the chapter: *Magical and Miraculous Practices of the Jews in Jesus' Day*.

³ Mt. 9 : 1-8; Mk. 2 : 1-12; Lk. 5 : 17-26. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 40, classifies this account, like the preceding one, among those of the pure paradigm type. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 12, classifies it among the apophthegms (*Streit- und Schulgespräche*). PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 47, makes a distinction between two parts: *Bitte-Sündenvergebung/Vorwurf-Abwehr durch Heilung*. "Die Verknüpfung von Wunder- und Ausspruchüberlieferung ist hier besonders eng." The roof episode is not "Ausgestaltung," but is based on an old tradition (p. 94). See KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, on the way this account fits into the whole of Mk. 2 : 1 - 3 : 35. For Capernaum (Tel-Hüm), see KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, pp. 215-230.

city;" Mark gives the name Capernaum, whilst Luke does not state any name. Jesus was "in the house," says Mark, which in all probability means in Peter's house, Mark and Luke state respectively that Jesus was preaching and teaching. Luke goes into the most detail here: "there were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by," who had come from all over, Lk. 5 : 17. Nothing is said about the time. The third Evangelist refers to a particular circumstance: "and the power of the Lord was present to heal them."¹ Whilst Matthew at once reports Jesus' words about the forgiveness of sins, Mark and Luke say something about the strange entry of the sick man into the house. A number of men — according to Mark "four" — lowered the man into the middle of the house after breaking open the roof. It was not difficult to make an opening in the roof, which was made from light material and coated with clay.² The possibility of breaking open roofs is also mentioned elsewhere.³

¹ See the chapter: Jesus' Activities as Healer.

² See GALLING, *Reallexikon*, col. 123, on the construction of the flat roof. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, p. 72: "Die Wände der Häuser wurden und werden nach Gressmann horizontal mit Holzstangen, Zweigen, Schilf oder Heu überdeckt und dann mit einem Lehmestrich überstrichen, der festgestampft und oft mit einer Steinwalze geglättet wird . . . Der Überzug des flachen Daches, das in der Regel Menschen und Tiere tragen kann, ist verhältnismässig dünn und muss jeden Herbst vor dem Winterregen auf seine Dichtigkeit hin geprüft werden; er ist daher leicht zu durchgraben und abzudecken (Mc. 2, 4)." Klostermann says that there were no tiled roofs in Palestine and points to the "tact" of the manuscripts (syrs) which omitted the words "through the tiling" from Lk. 5 : 19. KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*, says that Luke had therefore pictured to himself a Roman house. According to Keulers a "stone arch" or a "trapdoor" is out of the question. DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 78, note 2: "Lukas 5, 18 ist irrig ein Ziegeldach vorausgesetzt." Dalman says that a roof as meant in Mk. 2 : 4 can be broken open "stellenweise," "ohne dass es dadurch grossen Schade leidet." "Wenn man ein solches Dach öffnen wollte, musste man den Estrich aufhacken und darunter einige der kleinen Hölzer wegnehmen, was freilich kein Hausbesitzer sich ohne weiteres hätte gefallen lassen. Seine Herstellung forderte zwar nicht die Herstellung eines Gerüstes, aber die Bereithaltung grösserer Balken sowie kürzerer Hölzer, die von Balken zu Balken gelegt werden und das aus einer Lage von Dornen und einer Lehmschicht bestehende Dach tragen."

³ *Midr. Rabbah Lev.*, XIX, 6, relates how Nebuchadnezzar, at the intercession of his wife Shemirah (her name according to R. Huna), commanded that the wife of King Jeconiah, who was being held prisoner, be brought to him. "And how did they lower her [into the dungeon] to him? R. Shabbethai said: They lowered her down to him over the bars: whilst the Rabbis said: They opened the ceiling and let her down to him." Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 4, and I, p. 34 f. CICERO, *In M. Antonium oratio Philippica*, II, 18, 45, speaks of letting down through tiles: "cum tu tamen nocte socia . . . per tegulas demitterere." FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, XIV, XV, 12, refers to the breaking open of roofs to kill refugees crowded

This unusual procedure was already criticized long ago. How could all this happen without the dense multitude suffering injury? Why, asks WOOLSTON, was there such a crowd against the door? Could they not wait a few hours? Where was the owner when the roof of his house was broken open? The story is "monstrously romantick."¹

As the house very probably belonged to Peter, the question of the loss suffered by the owner of the house is not so important. What is important is the question of where Jesus was at that moment. Was the house large or small? EDERSHEIM thinks that it was a large house with a courtyard and a gallery giving access to the various rooms. Perhaps Jesus was standing in the entrance to the guest chamber, with the scribes beside Him or sitting on the gallery.² GODET and others believe on the other hand that the house was small and low, which, having regard to Peter's occupation, seems more plausible.³ It is not possible to reconstruct the situation, but in any case there must have been enough room to avoid the falling material at the point where Jesus was standing.

Luke states that the men set down the paralytic with his bed "before Jesus."⁴ Some scholars wonder whether there might perhaps have been a deeper meaning behind this procedure. CLEMEN recalls the common custom of carrying dead persons from a house via an unusual way, and at the same time points to the expulsion of demons through a hole made in the roof, through which the sick person is first let down, a practice followed in India.⁵ This idea was also pre-

together in the houses. Cf. *De bello Jud.*, I, XVII, 6: the roofs were demolished so that many died when the roofs fell in.

¹ WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, a Fourth Discourse, p. (54) ff.: "In my Opinion no Tale more monstrously romantick can be told." It is all: "Contradiction to Sense and Reason." Jesus' honour demands that it be explained allegorically: the paralytic is mankind; the four bearers are the four Evangelists, p. (62) . . . See also W. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 456 f. Ps. Justin, *Quaest. et resp. ad Orthod.*, already raised the difficulties.

² EDERSHEIM, *The Life and Time of Jesus the Messiah*, I, p. 501 ff.

³ GODET, *Lukas*.

⁴ As regards the "bed," see the chapter: *Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels*. Paralytics were often carried into the temple at Epidaurus on litters, too; see HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 23 (miracle 35); p. 35 (miracle 70).

⁵ CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 137 f. In India the (epileptic) boy possessed by a dog was: "in die Versammlungshalle, in welcher ein Zauber zur Vertreibung jenes Dämons vollzogen werden soll, durch eine im Dache gemachte Öffnung hineingehoben." (The quotation is from Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, p. 488.) This mode of operation was based on the theory: "s ist ein Gesetz der Teufel und Gespenster, wo sie hineingeschlüpft, da müssen

valent in the Graeco-Roman world: the person marked for death could not return in the ordinary way. According to Plutarch people who were reported missing were not allowed in through the door on their return: "but had to climb up on the roof and lower themselves down a rope, through an opening made in the roof or through the impluvium."¹

Data such as these are definitely most peculiar, and worth mentioning, but since according to the Evangelists the bearers of the sick man acted in this way because they could see no other opportunity of taking the paralysed man to Jesus — in Mk. 2 : 4 and Lk. 5 : 19 this is stated as the motive — there is no reason to look for other motives.

An important point is the unanimous witness of the authors that Jesus paid heed to the faith of the sick man and his bearers. There is no reason to assume that "their faith" must be confined to that of the bearers; they all believe in the power of Jesus.²

When the sick man lay on his bed before Jesus, He spoke and said: "Son, be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee."³ This

sie hinaus." Clemen asks: "Sollte es ursprünglich damit zusammenhängen, dass man Mk. 2, 1 ff. und Par. einen Kranken, der freilich nicht als dämonisch bezeichnet wird, durch das Dach herunterlässt? Dann würde sich die auffällige Operation noch leichter erklären; aber im Text selbst deutet nichts auf einen derartigen Grund hin."

¹ Plutarch, *Quaest. Rom.*, V, quoted by F. MULLER in Van der Leeuw, *De Godsdiensten der wereld*, II, p. 59 . . . Muller draws attention to the idea that the "dead" must begin a new life. When a slave or prisoner entered the dwelling of the priest of Jupiter, he had to be untied; "his bonds must be raised up through the impluvium . . . to the tiles and from there lowered to the street outside" (cf. Gellius, X, 15, 8). The way inside a house via the roof was regarded as the way of demons, of disease and death, of "bound life." Muller goes on to say: "Who is not reminded for a moment of the story in the Bible of how a sick man was brought to Jesus, not in the ordinary way, but via the roof, from which he was lowered to where the Healer stood (Mk. 2, 3; Lk. 5, 18)?"

² See KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium* . . . KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*, conveys the impression that the bearers seem to have had more faith than the sick man himself. GOULD, *St. Mark*, derives from τῇ πίστει αὐτῶν that faith does not form the psychological explanation of the healing, for "the faith of the others would have nothing to do with it, . . . but the spiritual condition of the miracle." BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, *Markus*, speaks of the "perceptibility" of their faith.

³ Mt. 9 : 2, θάρσει. See the chapter: *Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels* . . . Mk. 2 : 5, like Matthew, has "thy sins be forgiven thee." Lk. 5 : 20: "thy sins are forgiven thee." HAUCK, *Markus*. "Der passive Ausdruck ist dabei nach damals üblicher jüdischer Redeweise (Dalman, *Worte*, 183) verhüllte aktive Aussage über Gott: Gott vergibt dir!" Cf. BULTMANN, *TWNT*, I, p. 506 ff.

utterance gives rise to a couple of questions. In the first place it may be asked why Jesus spoke of the forgiveness of sins to this particular patient. Was there a causal connection between his disease and some sin or the other? Or was He depressed by the current Jewish belief that sin and disease were closely interconnected?¹ Although the possibility that in this case the physical suffering was in fact related to a certain sin cannot be entirely excluded, we must be very careful indeed about concluding that we are concerned here with a case of moral paralysis, bad conscience or something of that kind!² In our opinion the text offers the possibility of another solution. It should be borne in mind that Jesus was engaged on teaching. True, we are told nothing about the subject of His teaching at the moment that the paralysed man was brought in, but it is not inconceivable that Jesus' words to the paralytic were inspired by what He was busy teaching at that moment. In addition, there is the significant statement: "and the power of the Lord was present to heal them," Lk. 5 : 17. The salvation which had come in Jesus Christ was present in powerful fashion, operating to its full extent, being fulfilled.³

All of this might explain why Jesus spoke in this case of forgiveness of sins, without His making even the slightest reference to the man's possible personal guilt! For then, during the discussion with the Pharisees and the scribes, a sign would be given in this healing, a sign in which the saving "power of the Lord" would be revealed to its full extent. The stress falls on the forgiveness of sins, which is essential to the healing of man in his totality. For man is not restored when he is physically "better," but only when he is drawn body and soul within the Kingdom of God.⁴ We can therefore fully subscribe

¹ See the chapter: Relations involved in the Miracles of Jesus.

² WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, *Religion and Medicine*, p. 347, with reference to Mk. 2 : 1-12 and parallel passages: "In some way or other His inspired insight detects beneath the physical a moral paralysis, a disease of conscience, the sense of guilt, the pressure of some sin, which has led to this bodily distress." BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 84. WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 72: "It is possible that the boy's legs were paralysed and it is not fanciful to say that he could not 'walk away' from his sins" . . . "The curative factor is the forgiveness of sins" (p. 71). VAN LEEUWEN, Markus, rightly points out that Jesus did not say a word about the relation between sin and disease regarding the paralytic, "although with His words He goes to the uttermost depths of the man's misery."

³ GRUNDMANN, *TWNT*, II, p. 310.

⁴ VAN LEEUWEN, Markus. There is "an indissoluble connection between the spiritual goods and the temporary benefactions of the Kingdom which appeared

to RICHARDSON's remark that in Mk. 2 : 1-12 the importance of the miracle stories for Christology comes clearly to the fore.¹

In the second place we are struck by the fact that the transition from the words about forgiveness to those of the healing is via the corridor of the consultations by the Jewish leaders. They said among themselves that Jesus was guilty here of "blasphemies." For who can forgive sins but God alone?² These consultations originate in the belief that God alone has the power and the right to forgive sins. Even the Messiah lacked the power to do so; at least, there is no single reference in the Talmud which indicates otherwise. For this reason the consultations of the scribes are perfectly comprehensible: "This man blasphemeth."³ Jesus knew the "evil" that they were thinking in their hearts and countered His opponents by asking them which is "easier" to say: "thy sins be forgiven thee" or "arise, and walk?"⁴ For it is difficult to supply proof that the sins have been forgiven; this is an invisible process. It therefore seemed easier to announce that the

in Jesus. The spiritual goods take precedence and come first." DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*, says that Jesus said "das Entscheidende" in His words about forgiveness. He considers Jesus' words on healing: "demgegenüber nicht mehr von solcher Wichtigkeit." In our opinion Dehn puts this wrongly. HAUCK, *Lukas*: "Die Gewährung der Sündenvergebung ist Inhalt des Evangeliums und damit Jesu eigentlichstes Amt." Cf. RIDDERBOS, *De komst van het Koninkrijk*, p. 191. BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 85: "Man beachtet selten die hohe religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung dieses Wortes. Es bedeutet eine ganz neue Stellung zu dem Problem Sünde und Leiden."

¹ RICHARDSON, *The Miracle-stories of the Gospels*, p. 65 f.

² Mt. 9 : 3; Mk. 2 : 6, 7; Lk. 5 : 21.

³ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 495. STRACK-BILLERBECK, with reference to Mt. 26 : 65, goes in detail into the concept "blasphemy." βλασφημέω, *הַלְלָה*, was forbidden to the Israelites, cf. Ex. 22 : 28. There were three ways in which someone could act as a blasphemer, *הַלְלָה*: 1. in the wider sense by speaking impertinently of the Torah and thus of God; 2. by worshipping false idols; 3. in the narrower sense by cursing the name of Yahweh. Cf. BEYER, *TWNT*, I, p. 620 ff.: "Im NT ist der Begriff der Blasphemie durchaus vom Gedanken der Antastung von Gottes Macht und Hoheit bestimmt . . . Diesen strengen Begriff der Lästerung setzt das NT als den der Juden voraus, was durch LXX, Philo und Jos als berechtigt bestätigt wird. So erklärt es sich, dass folgerichtig Jesus selbst der Lästerung geziehen wird, als er—nach jüdischem Urteil zu Unrecht—den Anspruch erhebt, der Messias zu sein und sich Hoheitsrechte Gottes anmasst. Sobald Jesus dem Gelähmten seine Sünden vergibt, was Gott allein zusteht, denken die Schriftgelehrten: Er lästert Mk 2, 7 par."

⁴ See the section: Jesus' "knowledge." Mk. 2 : 8: Jesus perceived "immediately" in His spirit. GOULD, *St. Mark*: "without their saying anything, he knew inwardly, intuitively, what was going on in their minds." Jesus knew their position: "and the mere look of their faces would put him on the track of their thoughts."

man's sins had been forgiven. But everyone could see for himself at once whether healing would in fact follow; this announcement therefore seemed more difficult. Jesus continued impressively: "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins. . . Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house."¹ The healing was therefore not only performed as a display of mercy but was also emphatically meant as a manifestation; it was the visible proof that Jesus has the power to forgive sins. We have already pointed to the possibility that the subject of Jesus' teaching at the moment when the paralytic appeared was the "power" of the Lord and the power of the Son of Man to forgive sins. Jesus' introductory words: "But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins. . ." would in that case acquire a deeper background. For up to now Jesus had only *spoken* about this power; but through the performance of the act of healing the leaders of the Jews may now "know" that He does in fact possess this power! We can only voice a supposition here, but we are of the opinion that this specimen explanation has aspects which make the account as a whole more transparent.²

¹ Mt. 9 : 6; Mk. 2 : 11 and Lk. 5 : 24, with emphasis: σοὶ λέγω ἔγειρε. There are various interpretations of the meaning of ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in Mk. 2 : 10; see among others BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 12 ff. Bultmann regards Mk. 2 : 5-10 as an insertion apparently made: "weil die Gemeinde ihr Recht der Sündenvergebung auf Jesus zurückführen will." "Son of man" was "ursprünglich Umschreibung" for "I". Tödt, *Der Menschensohn in der synopt. Überlieferung*, has subjected Mk. 2 : 10 to a thorough analysis. He prefers to interpret the appellation "Son of man" not as "I," but as a "Würde-name," which is meant to emphasize Jesus' authority (p. 118). "Die Sündenvergebung, die in Mk 2, 10 Jesus für sein Erdenwirken beansprucht, ist also als Teilmoment seiner Sendung, seiner Vollmacht anzusehen" (p. 120). According to Tödt, Mk. 2 : 10 is not one of Jesus' authentic words. The disputations in Mark in their present form are: "nur aus der Situation der Gemeinde zu verstehen" (p. 121).

² DOEVE, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, has an important comment. He argues that Scripture played a leading part in Jesus and His disciples: "the method of expounding Scripture used by Jesus and the earliest Christians was none other than the method used in the Synagogue" (p. 140). With reference to Mt. 9 : 6 Doeve comments that the traditions do not state on what grounds Jesus possesses the power to forgive sins. "They only show by an incident, a sign, that he possesses this authority." Now if the concept ἐξουσία is employed, one is inclined in the first place to think of the שְׁלִטָּה, i.e. the dominion or power given to the Son of Man, Dan. 7 : 14. The Septuagint translates שְׁלִטָּה by ἐξουσία. One should further think of Isaiah 45 : 24. "The עֵץ of Yahweh may have been seen as transferred to the Son of Man in the שְׁלִטָּה of Dan. VII, 14." In Mt. 9 : 8 we are therefore concerned with a "transferred power." Furthermore, the power of the Son of Man to forgive sins can find support "by

The healing happened forthwith: the man stood up, took up his bed, and went to his house. Mark and Luke give a more vivid description of this than Matthew does.

How entirely different is the healing of paralytics in Epidauros! A man with stiff fingers dreams that the deity has jumped on to his hand and has stretched his fingers.¹ A paralytic dreams that he must place a ladder against the temple and must climb it, which he performs with success upon waking, etc.² Quite different, too, is the attitude of the healer: Aesculapius loses his temper, laughs at the sick man and calls him a coward.³

When those present had observed the healing of the man they were amazed: they glorified God for what they had heard and seen. Each of the Evangelists recounts this in his own fashion.⁴

the transference of the **קְרָא**, the Glory. For if it is correct, as we remarked above, that the transference of the Glory can give grounds for assuming that the **שְׁכִינָה**, the Divine Presence, rests upon the Son of Man, then one can apply to him Isaiah LVII 15 and 16." Now if the Divine Presence in the Son of Man is with the contrite and humble spirit (Isa. 57 : 15) to "revive" this spirit, this implies "that they receive forgiveness of their sins from the Son of Man" (p. 154 ff.). On p. 162 DOEVE repeats that we have seen that "one of the pathways by which Jesus could derive the right of forgiving sins from Scripture was by the following texts: Dan VII, 14, the transference of the **קְרָא**, linked with Isaiah LVII 15 and 16, the Shekinah of God, that is with men." The relations which Doeve shrewdly notes and plausibly presents reinforce our supposition that the teaching which Jesus was engaged on giving consisted in explaining the references in Scripture to the "power" of the Son of Man to "forgive" and "heal" . . . CHAJES, *Markus-Studien*, p. 14, seeks the solution in quite a different quarter. He reasons as follows: the Aramaic **שְׂרָא** means both "release" in the literal sense and "liberate from sin, forgive," in the figurative. Well then, in this way there is: "zwanglos eine sehr begreifliche Ideenassociation gegeben, die Jesum veranlasst hat, gerade dem Gelähmten Sündenvergebung zu versprechen."

¹ HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 9, miracle 3.

² HERZOG, *op. cit.*, p. 23, miracle 35: "N.N. von Epidauros, lahm (χολός). Dieser kam als Bittfleher in das Heiligtum auf einer Bahre. Als er im Heilraum schlief, sah er ein Gesicht: es träumte ihm, der Gott zerbreche seinen Stab und befehle ihm, eine Leiter herbeizubringen und so hoch wie möglich auf den Tempel zu steigen. Er habe es zuerst versucht, dann den Mut verloren und oben auf dem Gesims ausgeruht, zum Schluss aber habe er es aufgegeben und sei die Leiter langsam Tritt für Tritt heruntergestiegen. Asklepius habe sich zuerst geärgert über sein Handeln, dann habe er ihn ausgelacht, dass er so feig sei. Er wagte es, als es Tag geworden, die Aufgabe zu erfüllen, und ging ohne Leidschaden von dannen."

³ Cf. p. 23, miracle 35; Aesculapius does not help cowards, see p. 24 f., miracle 37.

⁴ As regards the amazement and the glorification, see the chapter: Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels. MENSCHING, *Das Wunder im Glauben u. Aberglauben der Völker*, comments on Lk. 5 : 26: "In diesem Erlebnisbericht ist in aller Deutlichkeit die Begegnung mit dem Heiligen in der typischen Reaktion

As regards the determination of the symptoms, this case too must remain nothing more than a surmise. The fact that the man had to be carried on his bed suggests a considerable degree of paralysis.¹

Was this perhaps a case of paralysis spinalis, caused by a disease of the spinal cord; was it some form or the other of rheumatism, or must the cause be sought in mental trouble? A number of exegetes are inclined to assume the last cause.² The healing would then have consisted in a mental energy being generated in the sick man by Jesus' words, as a result of which the man recovered the use of his limbs. This explanation is as such not implausible, provided that it is not postulated as the sole one on the basis of a certain Christology. For here too, as in all other healings, the danger is imminent that

des Staunens, der 'Furcht' (im Sinne des *mysterium tremendum*) und der lobpreisenden Bezeugung des Ungewöhnlichen erkennbar." In Mt. 9 : 8: "ist besonders bemerkenswert, dass Jesus als Mensch angesehen wird, in dessen Händen Gott numinose Macht gab" (p. 44 f.). With reference to Mt. 9 : 8, HELD, Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch. (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 261), remarks that the plural τοῖς ἀνθρώποις comprises Jesus *and* His community; Christology has received an ecclesiological accent . . . In other words, there are some considerable differences in interpretation!

¹ In Mt. 9 : 2, 6 and Mk. 2 : 3, 4, 5, 9 the man is called παραλυτικός. According to GOULD, St. Mark, this is Biblical Greek. It is the popular term. Lk. 5 : 18, 24 has παραλελυμένος, i.e. the medical term for this disease; see PLUMMER, St. Luke; VAN VELDHIJZEN, Lukas de Medicijnmeester, p. 108 . . . CANAAN, Aberglaube, p. 43, points out that this disease is still regarded seriously even today. "Manche Krankheiten werden als unheilbar angesehen wie Lähmung, deshalb heisst es auch: fäldisch lā t'äldisch = behandle keine Lähmung!"

² PAULUS, Exegetisches Handbuch, I, 2, p. 493: the man was "nervenkranke." EBSTEIN, op. cit., p. 79 f., says that we cannot make any exact scientific diagnoses. He points to the pronouncement of an authority in the field of nervous diseases, Dr. K. E. Hasse, who in his "Krankheiten des Nervenapparates," Erlangen 1855, speaks of cases of hysterical paralysis which are influenced by mental impressions. "In einer Fussnote macht Hasse in Bezug auf den 'entschiedenen Einfluss psychischer Eindrücke' folgende Bemerkung: 'Dies sind die Fälle für die Wunder, für den Eindruck der göttlichen Worte: Stehe auf und nimm dein Bett auf dich'." SENG, op. cit., p. 17, regards Jesus' words: "Thy sins be forgiven thee" as decisive for the healing. "Die Vergebung der Sünden räumt gewissermassen die inneren Dinge fort, deren äusserer Ausdruck die Lähmung war, und schaffte so in dem Kranken die Voraussetzung dafür, dass er die darauf folgende Weisung befolgen konnte." It is therefore a case of a purely mental mechanism of origin. "Denn dass die Gelenke wie etwa bei der heute als Gicht bezeichneten Krankheit verändert waren, kann man sich bei der Geschwindigkeit der Heilung nicht denken." FENNER, op. cit., p. 56 f., thinks of paralysis of the lower extremities. "An eine von organischer Erkrankung des Rückenmarks ausgehende Abasie ist demnach nicht zu denken, vielmehr dürften funktionelle Lähmungserscheinungen vorgelegen haben, wie sie gerade die Hysterie oft in schwereren Formen zeigt, als sie bei organischen Erkrankungen beobachtet werden." There are cases of hysterical paralysis which last for years.

"diagnosis" will be guided by the Christology which one professes! It will always have to be borne in mind that some of the diseases described so sparsely and vaguely in the New Testament may in reality have been of a very serious nature, whilst others were very mild.

STRAUSS has offered a solution in his familiar manner: healings of this kind must be seen in the light of Isa. 35 : 3, 6. If Jesus was the Messiah, then He had to perform this kind of miracle, too.¹

To sum up, we may say:

- (a) The account of the strange way in which the paralytic appeared before Jesus need not be legendary.
- (b) Probably the theme of Jesus' teaching gave rise to His words about the forgiveness of sins. There need therefore be no question of a special relation between sin and disease in the case of this man.
- (c) Jesus' method of treatment nevertheless demonstrates that there is a close connection between forgiving and healing.
- (d) This healing is of a distinctly demonstrative nature. The power of the Son of Man on earth to forgive sins is proved by an observable fact.
- (e) Within the framework of Christology this miracle figures largely, since, as a function and sign of the Kingdom of God, it announces and presents salvation to man in his totality.²

¹ STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 94.

² CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mt. 9 : 1, considers the real reason why the Evangelists dwell at such length on this miracle to be that the scribes resented the fact that "Christ assumed the right and the power to forgive sins. But Christ was desirous of confirming and setting the seal on this power by a visible sign" (*Alia tamen peculiaris ratio est cur in hoc miraculo magis quam in aliis insistant Evangelistae, quod scilicet indigne tulerint scribae Christum sibi ius et potestatem sumere remittendi peccata: Christus vero eam visibili signo sancitam esse et obsignatam voluit*). KORFF, *Christologie*, II, p. 128, says of Mt. 9 : 2 and parallel passages and Lk. 7 : 47: "We must recognize that this forgiveness of sin by Jesus is practically the supreme expression of that to which Jesus laid claim for himself, and at the same time the supreme demonstration that the Kingdom of God is nigh. He bestows Messianic salvation." RENGSTORF, *Das NTD*, I, 2, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, also perceives in this case a piece of spiritual care. "Im Grunde ist es ein Stück Seelsorge an den Schriftgelehrten, die mit formalen Begriffen an ihn herantreten. Darum hat die Frage in vs. 23 die Form, die *sie* ihr geben würden." This view does not seem tenable to us.

(d) *The paralytic at Jerusalem (Bethesda)*

Jn. 5 : 1-18 gives a lengthy description of how a man who had been ill for thirty-eight years was healed by Jesus. Jesus had travelled to Jerusalem on the occasion of a "feast of the Jews." No further details are given of this feast, and various possibilities have been envisaged: Passover, Pentecost, the Feast of the Tabernacles, Purim, etc.

BULTMANN places Jn. 5 after Jn. 6 and believes that the feast referred to in Jn. 5 : 1 is identical with the Passover mentioned in Jn. 6 : 4.¹

Whatever the feast may have been, it had moved Jesus to "go up" — these words had acquired through fixed usage a certain cultic ring and religious value — to Jerusalem.²

First the scene of the event is described in verses 2-5. In Jerusalem, near the sheep market, there was a pool, called in Hebrew Bethesda, which had five porches or porticos. The readings of this text display considerable discrepancies. In the Vulgate, for instance, the idea of a "sheep's pool" is still preserved.³ The pool itself is given various

¹ BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 179: "Das Fest ist nicht bestimmt bezeichnet; aber es kann doch wohl nur das Passahfest gemeint sein, das 6.4 bevorstand, und dem dann in Kap. 7 nach einigem Abstand das Laubhüttenfest folgt." KEULERS, Joannes, is not in favour of a change in the order of the chapters. He takes the Passover of Jn. 6 : 4 for the third Passover and leaves the choice open between various festivals for 5 : 1. STAUFFER, *Jesus, Gestalt u. Gesch.*, thinks that the Feast of the Tabernacles is meant; p. 17, cf. p. 62: "Wenn in jüdischen, zumal in sakraltheologischen Texten vom 'Fest' (= chag, chagga) ohne Näherbestimmung gesprochen wird, so ist das Laubhüttenfest gemeint." Cf. DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 290: "I conceive it to be the duty of an interpreter at least to see what can be done with the document as it has come down to us before attempting to improve upon it." Cf. pp. 340 and 406 ff. The fact that some mss. have "the feast" instead of "a feast" does not bring us much further, and among exegetes "the greatest dissension therefore prevails" (Keulers). As regards the re-arrangement of the order of the chapters, we should like to comment that every re-arrangement, however shrewdly it may be reasoned out and elucidated, is always open to dispute and supersession. The exegete can keep on "supposing" without ever "finding out." DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, classifies the account as a "Novelle." "Der Kranke am Teiche Bethzatha Joh. 5, 1 ff. wird mit Erzählerfreude geschildert: seine Umgebung, die lange Krankheit, die vielen vergeblichen Heilungsversuche" (p. 89).

² Cf. SCHNEIDER, *TWNT*, I, p. 516 ff. To go up, ἀναβαίνω, עָלָה, is the standard expression for going up to Jerusalem and the temple; see Jn. 2 : 13; 5 : 1; 11 : 55.

³ The Vulgate has *Probatia piscina*, i.e. Sheep's Pool. From Origen onwards the old scholars gave the name of the gate to the pool; cf. KEULERS, *op. cit.* KEULERS also states the opinion of F. M. ABEL (*Jerusalem*, II, p. 669) that the interpretation must be: "There is at Jerusalem near the sheep's (pool) (another) pool, etc.," from which it may be derived that there were two pools there, one

names in Hebrew, i.e. Aramaic here: Bethesda, Bethsaida, Bezetha, Bethsatha.¹ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS speaks several times of Bezatha, which was the new northern area of Jerusalem, separated from the old part of Jerusalem by a chasm — Bezetha probably means chasm, cleft, piece cut off.²

In the vicinity of the sheep market mentioned by John a double pool was exhibited as the "Sheep's Pool" in the fourth century. This was surrounded by four porticos, and was divided in two by a fifth one. According to EUSEBIUS both pools were filled with rain water and the water of one of the pools was red in colour. Other authors refer to strange whirlpools.³

The reading "Bethesda," however attractive it may be on account of its beautiful meaning of "house of mercy," will therefore have to be replaced by that of Bezetha or Bezatha.

Now there were always people to be found by this pool who were suffering from various diseases: "blind, halt, withered," verse 3, waiting for healing.⁴ The following passage makes it clear why they gathered there; they were "waiting for the moving of the water.

intended for the washing of the sacrificial animals, the other for the sick. Cf. also BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. BARRETT, *St. John*. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, pp. 364-371, gives many details . . . The Sheep's Gate is mentioned in Neh. 3 : 1, 32; 12 : 39; it lay to the north-east of the temple.

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 442 ff., states what should be understood by "Hebrew" . . . Βηθεσδα, אֲרֻזָּתָא, place of mercy, is Aramaic (p. 453).

² FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *De bello Jud.*, V, IV, 2.

³ DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 325 ff. Cf. DALMAN, *Jerusalem u. sein Gelände*, pp. 108 f., 141. . . . According to STRACK-BILLERBECK Flavius Josephus' explanation that Bezetha means "new town" is "irreführend." "Vermutlich will Josephus mit jener Erklärung sagen, dass die Vorstadt Bezetha auch 'Neustadt' καινή πόλις genannt worden sei." DALMAN, on the other hand, subscribing to Flavius Josephus' view of a new part of the town situated at a high and a low level, thinks of the Aramaic word beza'tā, i.e. "Abschnitt," division, sector (*Jerusalem u. sein Gelände*, p. 108 f.). BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, thinks that the allegorical meaning of Bethesda speaks "gegen die Ursprünglichkeit" . . . Bultmann is rightly opposed to the allegorical liberties taken with the porticos. The five porticos are said to represent the five books of Moses or five Jewish groupings. The Sheep's Gate represents the "shepherd" Jesus and the pool "baptism." In particular WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, Third Discourse, p. (50) ff., already revelled in the allegorical interpretation by the Fathers. In his opinion they understood the deeper meaning. Jerusalem is the new Jerusalem. The festival was Pentecost (Irenaeus, Chrysostom, Cyril). The angel = the Spirit of Christ. The paralytic = mankind in general, as Cyril and Augustine say. The pool represents baptism.

⁴ Some mss. add the παραλυτικοί to this list. It follows from the fact that then the three terms for paralytics (χωλός, ξηρός and παραλυτικός) are given that this group was very well represented.

For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had," verses 3 and 4. This part is absent from many manuscripts. A noteworthy point, however, is that verse 3b, "waiting for the moving of the water," occurs more in the manuscripts than verse 4. The result is that some exegetes regard verse 3 as "genuine," though they are sceptical about verse 4. They do so because otherwise verse 7 would as it were be left hanging in the air.¹ We cannot go into this problem of textual criticism here. Whether the text is in part or in its entirety a gloss, it does give us a good impression of popular belief. The curative power of the water was ascribed to a supernatural force. There were both good and bad water spirits. The demons heated the water of the spring, and it was the spirits friendly to man who imparted its curative power to it.²

FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS has a number of things to say about healing springs. Near the citadel of Machaerus two springs were located close together, one giving cold water and the other hot. When mixed together they gave a pleasant bath, which helped against many diseases and strengthened the nerves.³

At Ammaus, near Tiberias, there was a warm medicinal spring.⁴

¹ KEULERS, *op. cit.*, remarks: "In this matter textual criticism has the ultimate deciding voice, and it compels us to abandon the authenticity of verse 4, while that of verse 3b remains dubious."

² Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 453 f., who gives an example of a water demon moving the water of a spring . . . Cf. JIRKU, *Die Dämonen u. ihre Abwehr im A.T.*, p. 64 ff., on the power of water to drive out demons. "Living water" is more than a material substance. CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 30 ff. Springs which bubble up without any apparent cause are a mystery to primitive peoples. "Zweifelloos war dies der erste Impuls, der den Orientalen bewegte, sie mit übernatürlichen Kräften zu verknüpfen. Allmählich wurden einige Wassergeisten von den Seelen von Heiligen, ja in einzelnen Fällen von Gottheiten verdrängt." . . . "Quellen, welche von guten Geistern bewohnt sind, zeigen eine übernatürliche Heilkraft, und sind zu Heilzwecken noch immer sehr gesucht," cf. 2 Ki. 5; Jn. 5 : 1-5; 9 : 6, 7 . . . VITA APOLL., I, 6, states that near Tyana there was a pool, called Asbama, and dedicated to Zeus. The water had a healing effect on honest men, but oath-breakers were punished forthwith by all kinds of diseases. TERTULLIAN, *De Anima*, cap. I, tells of "wondrous kinds of water," which make a man drunk, poison him, etc. "Even before Christ there was a medicinal lake in Judea" (*Fuit et Judaeae lacus medicus ante Christum*). It is not stated which lake that was. WASZINK, *Tertullian De Anima*, says in his commentary on cap. 50: "Gemeint ist die piscina Bethesda (Io. 5, 2-4) vgl. bapt. 5 (R.W. 205, 29). Jud. 13" (p. 275).

³ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *De bello Jud.*, VII, VI, 3.

⁴ *De bello Jud.*, IV, I, 3.

Herod the Great had himself taken across the Jordan to the hot waters of Callirrhoë, which brought relief if used externally and were pleasant if taken internally.¹ And so popular belief attributed healing force to the water of Bezatha too; note especially the "troubling" of the water. Probably there was an intermittent supply of water, which either had natural causes or was artificially regulated. On the strength of Eusebius' account the red colour and the curative power of the water have sometimes been ascribed to the entrails and the blood of animal sacrifices, or the power of the water has been attributed to the presence of certain minerals, such as metal salts.² Whatever the cause of the belief in the healing power of the water may have been, we can in any case deduce from the gloss that as soon as motion was detected in the water, there was a *race en masse* to reach the pool "first" and lower oneself into the water.

MEAD cannot imagine that in each case only one sick person was healed. He supposes that many were the "first" simultaneously: "and it is not surprising that only those who were the first to enter the water were healed, since the medicinal properties of the water disappeared quickly after the water had moved, leaving behind a stagnant pool."³ There is in fact something to be said for this view.

¹ De bello Jud., I, XXXIII, 5. Cf. Antiq., XVII, VI, 5. . . . The Roman architect Vitruvius Pollio (fl. at the beginning of the Christian era) describes in De Architectura, VIII, 3, 4, the effect of natural mineral water on the diseased body, depending on whether this water contains sulphur, alum, tar, etc. Water containing alum heals paralysis, among other things (ELAUT, Antieke Geneeskunde, p. 333).

² Cf. SALVADOR, Jésus Christ et sa Doctrine, I, p. 235 f. Cf. MEAD, Medicina Sacra, p. 50 ff. Mead, a doctor, himself has the effect of metal salts, etc., in mind. PREUSS, Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin, p. 352. Bethesda: "war ein Bad im modernen Sinne mit einem 'Kurhaus'." Here lay the sick, the blind and the lame. "Es soll dadurch, dass die Priester die Opfertiere in dem Teich wuschen (!), besonders zur Zeit der grossen Feste, eine Art Schlammbad und als solches . . . zur Heilung Rheumatischer besonders geeignet gewesen sein."

³ MEAD, op. cit., p. 57. It is best to take as a collective: "ita ut qui primus intraret per enallagen interpretandum sit, qui primi intrarent: nec mirum eos tantum sanatos esse, qui primum ingressi sunt; quoniam virtus aquae medicinalis cito post turbationem aufugiebat et vappam inertem relinquebat." . . . Cf. the following story, Midr. Rabbah Lev. XXII, 4. "R. Tanhuma said: The Holy One, blessed be He, accomplishes His purpose even through the agency of water. An incident is related of a certain man suffering from boils who went down to bathe in Tiberias. It so happened that he floated into Miriam's well, and he bathed there and was healed." Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 454. As regards the "angel" that moved the water, Strack-Billerbeck points to the "spirit [angel] of the sea," Enoch 60 : 16; the "spirits of the water," Enoch 69 : 22 and further to Enoch 61 : 10; 66 : 2; Slav. Enoch 19 : 4. Cf. Rev. 16 : 5 on the ἀγγελος τῶν

Among the many sick persons there was a man "which had an infirmity thirty and eight years," verse 5. The unprecedentedly long duration of the man's illness has given rise to the question whether this account might not be an allegory, with the thirty and eight years of which Deu. 2 : 14 speaks — the length of divine punishment — possibly playing a symbolic role here. BULTMANN rightly rejects this and other allegorical explanations; he himself has in mind the "topic of the healing stories."¹ There is, however, another view, viz. that the man had not been ill for thirty-eight years, but was thirty-eight years old! The rationalist PAULUS interprets the text in this way; the story was therefore concerned with a man in the best years of his life.² This view is grammatically defensible, but the comment of the Evangelist in verse 6 that the man "had been now a long time in that case" — PAULUS says: yes, but surely not for thirty-eight years! — supports the translation as it stands. It can hardly be assumed that the man waited by the pool all those years. He doubtless belonged to the "regulars" among the sick there.

The disease from which the man was suffering is not stated. It may be deduced from the statement that Jesus saw the man "lie," verse 6, and from the words of the sick man: "Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool," that the man was seriously hampered in his movements, or at least was not able to walk.

SENG believes that this disease, like that in Mk. 2 : 4, must be diagnosed as a paralysis due to mental causes. He eliminates rheumatism

ὕδατος . . . PAULUS, *Commentar über das NT*, IV, 1, p. 263: the water was used only when it was vigorously moved; what a pity that, as a result of the superstition, it was not constantly in use! WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, Third Discourse, p. (41), makes the sarcastic comment: "whether the Angel descended with his Head, or his Heels foremost, or whether he might not come swamping upon his Breast into the Waters, like a Goose into a Horse-pond."

¹ BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 236. *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 180, note 7: "Die Angabe der langen Dauer der Krankheit gehört zur Topik der Heilungsgeschichten."

² PAULUS, *op. cit.*, IV, 1, p. 290: "Es war aber dort um seiner Kränklichkeit Willen ein 38 Jahre alter Mensch." Grammatically speaking, Paulus' interpretation is not impossible. A possible literal translation is: "And a certain man was there—having 38 years—in his infirmity." Construction and context determine the translation here. One can read it as: "having 38 years in his infirmity," i.e. ill for 38 years. But one can also interpret it as meaning that the man "was there," "having" the age of 38 years (cf. the same construction in Jn. 8 : 57: "πεντήκοντα ἔτη οὕτω ἔχεις") and he was there "in his infirmity," which can also be translated by "through" or "because of" his infirmity (cf. Mt. 6 : 7: "ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν," i.e. because of, on account of their much speaking).

of the joints. The expression "palsy" is according to SENG a popular word in the New Testament, which tells us nothing about the disease, but merely designates the external symptoms.¹ FENNER invokes this pronouncement and draws attention to the fact that hysterical paralysis sometimes lasts for dozens of years on end. We may not regard this as an organic disease, a disease of the spinal cord, which would have prevented the man from walking, but must see it as a functional paralysis resulting from a severe case of hysteria.² Others are of the opinion that the man suffered more from laziness than paralysis! WOOLSTON passes stern judgment on the so-called "infirmity" of this man.³ According to PAULUS he suffered from an "insignificant" disease, whilst he "merely abused the charity of that hospital." He did not want to be cured, so that he could beg!⁴ VON AMMON calls him a stationary patient, like those who are to be found everywhere in baths and outside church doors, who was in imminent danger of being destroyed by an idle and worthless life.⁵

Jesus saw the man lying there and addressed him as follows: "Wilt thou be made whole?" The initiative was thus taken by Jesus. The remark that Jesus "knew" that the man "had been now a long time in that case" has given rise to the question whether this must be regarded as a natural or supernatural knowledge by Jesus. KEULERS believes that Jesus' knowledge of the long duration of the disease was "not necessarily supernatural;" He could have been told about it by other patients.⁶ However, to the fourth Evangelist Jesus is the Son of God from whom nothing is hidden. Jesus'

¹ SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 17.

² FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, pp. 57, 60 . . . BRANDT, *Das ewige Wort*: the man was: "vielleicht gelähmt." BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 180, note 5. The disease is not further specified: "aber nach V. 8 f. (in Vergleich mit Mk. 2, 11) liegt es näher, Lahmheit als Blindheit anzunehmen."

³ WOOLSTON, *op. cit.*, p. (34): "this man's Infirmity was more Laziness than Lameness, and Jesus only shamed him out of his pretended Illness."

⁴ PAULUS, *op. cit.*, IV, 1, p. 264. Cf. WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 56: "It is possible that the patient found it more interesting and more profitable to remain in the spotlight of publicity and in the receipt of sympathy and alms, and to maintain his illness for these reasons, than to be cured and thus to be uninteresting and compelled to earn a living or starve." Many nervous patients cling to their diseases, says Weatherhead, so as to receive sympathy and love.

⁵ VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, II, p. 198 ff.

⁶ KEULERS, *Joannes*. On the other hand among others BARRETT, *op. cit.*: "John no doubt thinks of supernatural knowledge, not inference from observation. Cf. 1.47 f."

question: "Wilt thou be made whole?" has likewise given rise to a number of questions. Was it Jesus' intention to arouse the sick man's confidence? Was it necessary for his weakened will to be given a stimulus? ¹ Or did Jesus' words contain a reproachful note: you do not seem to want to get better, for otherwise you would have been healed long ago; are you really serious about being cured? ²

The sick man's answer is contained in a straightforward complaint: "Sir, I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool: but while I am coming, another steppeth down before me." The man was therefore always too late.

It is difficult to form an idea of what exactly happened. Did the water move only rarely, e.g. once a year, as some of the older exegetes believed? The text says that it happened "at a certain season," which may point to a more frequent occurrence of the motion. ³ Did the water move only for a moment and unexpectedly, at one certain point, so that only the nearest sick person could seize the favourable opportunity? ⁴ The main point is this: the water in the pool moved now and again, and according to popular belief the one who was first in the water was healed. There is something tragic and surprising in the fact that this sick man had been "coming" year in, year out, and had always failed. Was the man after all rather indolent?

Jesus addressed the man as follows: "Rise, take up thy bed, and walk," verse 8. Nothing is said about the presence of "faith" in the sick man. At most one may surmise that he regarded Jesus as a helper who would carry him to the pool, so that Jesus' command

¹ BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 181, note 1, rejects such psychological explanations as "false".

² PAULUS, *op. cit.*, IV, 1, p. 263. Jesus did not add to His question: do you want to be healed by *me*? The question was therefore not meant to inspire confidence. The meaning is: "du scheinst nicht gesund werden zu wollen, sonst wärest du es schon lange! Als einen Vorwurf versteht auch der Kranke die Frage." He apologizes. WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 56: "It is incredible that for thirty-eight years the patient was incapable of getting himself into the moving waters if he had seriously wanted to try this treatment."

³ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 180, note 7: "Erwägungen der alten Exegeten, dass der Engel nur selten kam, etwa nur einmal jährlich an dem genannten Fest, sind eingetragen."

⁴ KEULERS, *op. cit.* "Perhaps the movement of the water only went on for a short time and at a certain place, or the authorities, to prevent disorder, allowed only one patient at a time to go down into the water (Lagrange)."

must have surprised him greatly.¹ The man was healed immediately, took up his bed and went on his way, verse 9. PAULUS thinks that in part the man did not dare pose as more sick than he was, and in part, he was in fact in the process of getting better. He left: "like someone driven by his bad conscience." He showed no trace of joy.²

The next statement: "and on the same day was the sabbath," introduces a new phase, verses 10-13. The Jews saw the man carrying his bed. It is not necessary to regard this as a deliberate breach of the Sabbath.³ Carrying the bed as such was simply a breach of the Sabbath; it came under the category relating to the carrying of burdens on the Sabbath, i.e. it was one of the thirty-nine important activities which were forbidden on that day.⁴ On the strength of their laws the Jews therefore rightly said: "It is the sabbath day: it is not lawful for thee to carry thy bed." The healed man defended himself by the remark that he was acting under orders: "He that made me whole, the same said unto me. . ." In their further questions the Jews proved to have not the slightest interest in the healing as such; they were concerned with what had prompted the offender to commit his offence. "What man is that which said unto thee, Take up thy bed, and walk?," verse 12. The expression "man" need not be interpreted in a derogatory sense.⁵ It may be deduced from the fact that the Jews did not have the slightest interest in the healing that miracle-workers were a not infrequent phenomenon

¹ It does not necessarily follow from the similarity of Jesus' command to this sick person to the commands in Mt. 9 : 6; Mk. 2 : 9, 11 and Lk. 5 : 24 that John is giving here a more elaborate account of the paralytic in Mk. 2. . . . As regards the taking up of the bed, see the chapter: Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels.

² PAULUS, op. cit., IV, 1, p. 261 ff.

³ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 181, note 2. "Nach Hirsch bedeutet es eine demonstrative Verletzung der Sabbatsitte, wenn der Geheilte auf Jesu Befehl 'mit dem Bett auf den Rücken unter den Juden öffentlich hin und her geht.' Damit ist aber das *περιπάτει* zu sehr belastet."

⁴ See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 454 ff., where the ban on carrying or moving objects on the Sabbath is discussed in detail . . . "Zu dem Satz Joh 5, 10: 'Es ist dir nicht erlaubt, das Bett zu tragen' vgl. Schab 10, 5: Wer einen lebenden Menschen [am Sabbat] auf dem Bett [aus einem Bereich in einen andren] hinausträgt, ist straffrei auch wegen [des Tragens] des Bettes, weil das Bett Anhängsel von jenem ist . . . Das blosse Bett fortzuschaffen war also dem Geheilten Joh 5, 10 verboten; hätte er aber auf dem Bett auch noch einen lebenden Menschen hinausgeschafft, so wäre gegen sein Tun nichts zu erinnern gewesen" (p. 461).

⁵ KEULERS, op. cit., perceives in *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* a note of disdain. This is not so with BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 181, note 8: "Dass *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* verächtlich sei, wird man kaum heraushören dürfen; die Juden wollen offenbar einfach den Tatbestand feststellen."

at the pool, or at least that remarkable healings or improvements had several times occurred. However, the healed man did not know who his benefactor was: "for Jesus had conveyed himself away, a multitude being in that place," verse 13. Did He wish to avoid a conflict or a possible crowd of sick persons around Him?

Verse 14 contains the account of the second meeting between Jesus and the healed man, this time in the temple. When that was is not stated. KEULERS supposes that the man took the bed home or perhaps left it on the spot on the orders of the Jews. Then he went to the temple: "doubtless to thank God." BULTMANN thinks of the many people who would be encountered in the temple.¹ Again the initiative is taken by Jesus; He addresses the man in a serious tone: "Behold, thou art made whole: sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee." Must we deduce from this utterance that the disease from which the man had suffered was due to certain sins? VON AMMON believes that Jesus warned him against idleness and begging.² Two things can be clearly derived from the text. Firstly, the healing of the man was a fact; secondly, Jesus did not stop at the physical healing, but insisted on a complete change, a spiritual healing.

One can surmise, but not establish, a relation between the man's sins and his disease. Something worse might happen to him. This might be taken to mean a "worse" disease, or some form or the other of chastisement, indeed eternal punishment. BULTMANN sees in this the Jewish belief in retribution.³ GRUNDMANN thinks that the "worse thing"

¹ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 181 f., note 10: "Wieviel Zeit verstrichen ist, hat kein Interesse. Der Tempel ist wohl genannt als Ort, an dem man erwarten darf, viele Menschen anzutreffen."

² VON AMMON, *op. cit.*, II, p. 201: "Der tieferblickende Menschenkenner warnt ihn vor dem Müssiggange, der Heuchelei und Lügenhaftigkeit der jüdischen Mendicität." Cf. PAULUS, *op. cit.*, IV, 1, p. 265: Jesus warns the man: "vor weiteren Ausschweifungen." WEATHERHEAD, *op. cit.*, p. 57 f., sees the matter as follows: the sick man "had produced his illness to escape facing life" and Jesus: "was guarding him against a more painful illness." The sinful way of life of the man, which he had deliberately begun, had become a mechanism, and the strict words spoken by Jesus after His "sin no more" were meant to help him to feel his guilt and to conquer his sin.

³ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 182: "Es bewegt sich also in der Sphäre des jüdischen Vergeltungsglaubens, der Krankheit auf Sünde zurückführt, . . . höchst auffallend als Wort des Joh. Jesus, das den 9, 2 f. verworfenen Grundsatz akzeptiert. Im übrigen hat das Wort keine Beziehung zu der V. 10 aufgeworfenen Frage, und V. 14 hat nur die Bedeutung, die nächste Szene zu ermöglichen." BARRETT, *op. cit.*, "The *χεῖρόν* τι can hardly be anything other than the Judgement (cf. V, 29)."

that may happen to the healed man is death: "from sin to death."¹

Although we do not know what Jesus meant exactly, we can nevertheless deduce from the great seriousness of His words that the "worse thing" would do the man tremendous harm. It would be a calamity which would form a sharp contrast to the salvation which the man had just been permitted to receive in his healing.²

During this second encounter the man had found an opportunity to learn the name of his benefactor. He went and told the Jews Jesus' name, verse 15. Opinions differ as to why he did this. It is striking that the Evangelist does not mention a trace of gratitude on the part of the healed man. PAULUS and VON AMMON suppose that the man was driven by evil intent and feelings of vengeance.³ However, it is difficult to fit this view in with the sick man's answer to Jesus' question as to whether he wished to be healed, verses 6 and 7.

UBBINK, KEULERS and others seek the motive in gratitude.⁴ Attempts have also been made to find the motive in the man's obedience to or his fear of the Jewish authorities: he wanted to exonerate himself.⁵ However, we must note that the man merely named Jesus

¹ GRUNDMANN, TWNT, I, p. 310 f., note 151: "Das *χεῖρον*, das dem Geheilten begegnen kann, ist der *Θάνατος* aus der Sünde *πρὸς Θάνατον* (vgl Schl J 145). Damit ist der Zusammenhang zwischen Sünde, Leid und Tod festgehalten. Zerschlagen aber wird das rechnende Schema, das bei jedem Leid die sündige Ursache sucht (J 9, 2.3), weil dieses Schema den Blick blendet gegenüber dem Wirken Gottes in seiner begnadenden und begabenden Weise" . . . Cf. Jn. 8 : 21: "ye . . . shall die in your sins."

² Cf. Mt. 12 : 45: "and the last state of that man is worse than the first." 2 Pe. 2 : 20: if they backslide: "the latter end is worse with them than the beginning." . . . Cf. GRUNDMANN on the concept *κακός*, TWNT, III, p. 470 ff. "Mit dem Ausdruck *τὰ κακά* wird auch im NT das Unheil, das einen Menschen trifft, bezeichnet, sowohl im irdischen wie im ewigen Dasein" (p. 480).

³ PAULUS, op. cit., IV, 1, p. 265: "Gerne nennt er Jesus. Hatte er ihn doch so unerwartet aus der erwünschten Lage eines Kranken, welcher nicht gesund werden wollte und dazu gerne eine Ausrede fand, kurz eines verstellten Bettelkranken, hinaus gewiesen." VON AMMON, op. cit., II, p. 201: the man endeavoured to find out Jesus' name so as to be able to make Him known.

⁴ UBBINK, Het evangelie van Johannes. "The healed man is full of gratitude towards his saviour." If the authorities know of Jesus' deed: "surely they will recognize Jesus' right to utter the abhorred command and not accuse him, the healed man, of breaking the Sabbath?" KEULERS, op. cit. "His words are full only of gratitude; he does not suspect that anyone will trouble Jesus for what he has done."

⁵ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 182, note 5: "Dass er sich durch seine Anzeige von dem Verdacht reinigen wolle, die Gültigkeit des Sabbatgebotes zu bestreiten (Schl.) wäre als Motiv vorauszusetzen, sofern man überhaupt nach einem Motiv fragen darf. Aber der Leser ist offenbar nicht zu einem Urteil über das Verhalten des Geheilten herausgefordert; das Interesse an ihm erlischt mit V. 15."

as his healer and not as the one who had ordered him to take up his bed. In our opinion it is not possible to indicate one particular motive; doubtless various reasons moved the healed man to inform the Jewish leaders.

Again the Sabbath conflict comes up, verses 16-18. The Jews want to persecute Jesus for breaking the Sabbath. They were concerned not only with this single case; the accusation said that Jesus did "these things" on the Sabbath. BULTMANN therefore rightly remarks that the Evangelist wants to describe the Jewish attitude to Jesus on the basis of His entire way of acting.¹ Jesus' answer: "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work," fanned the indignation of the Jews still more violently, and strengthened their resolve to kill Him.

By this pronouncement Jesus in no way wanted to abolish the commandment that the Sabbath should be a day of rest; He wanted to make it clear that God is a living God, whose wonderful work in the order of nature and the order of salvation never ceases.² In the Gospel of John in particular the miracles of Jesus are characterized as "works" which bear witness to the salvation manifested in Him.³

However, the Jews had not the least thought for Jesus' "work" — cf. the questioning of the healed man, verses 10-13 — their keen attention being devoted exclusively to the "Sabbath-breaker" and "blasphemer" Jesus, "because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his father, making himself equal with God," verse 18. Though man is created in God's image, this does not mean that he is equal to God! In the Talmud four persons are branded as haughty because they had made themselves equal to God: the pagan rulers Hiram, Nebuchadnezzar and the Pharaoh, and the Israelite King Joash. On several occasions the name "gods" is also applied in rabbinical exegesis to men; but as soon as one applied this name to oneself, one was regarded as a blasphemer.⁴

¹ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 182, note 7.

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 461 ff., recalls the profound comment which Philo, Leg. alleg. 1, 3, makes about Gen. 2 : 2: "Nie hört Gott auf zu schaffen, sondern wie es dem Feuer eigentümlich ist zu brennen u. dem Schnee zu kühlen, so auch Gott zu schaffen; u. das um soviel mehr, als er für alle übrigen der Grund des Handelns ist." Cf. also BERTRAM, TWNT, II, p. 636, who interprets Jn. 5 : 17, ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται, in the sense of: my Father worketh "noch immer."

³ See the chapter: Jesus as Miracle-Worker.

⁴ STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 462 ff. Cf. BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 183, note 1. Bultmann considers the rabbinical exegesis of אלהים as "men" of just as little importance to an understanding of John 5 : 18: "wie der griech. Gebrauch von

In the verses that then follow the Evangelist reproduces the personal testimony of Jesus. The oneness of Father and Son, in being and in works, is discussed here at greater length. The person of the healed man has now left the scene entirely; in the work of salvation performed on him the Jews have thus been able to discover only the traits of disintegration and blasphemy.¹

We have already made a passing remark about the fact that at quite an early stage attempts were made to discover a theological background, or at least a "deeper" meaning, in this story of a healing. This was done by means of incidental symbolism, that is to say it was believed that the various parts of the account contained concealed representations, such as the five books of Moses, which were represented by the five porches, etc. We also encounter a systematic symbolism, in which the Gospel of John is explored from a particular point of view, on the strength of all kinds of factors. The result of this exploration is the belief that the fourth Gospel is dominated by a certain relation between theological ideas and symbols. This is instanced by the views of Cullmann and Dodd. CULLMANN is of the opinion that one of the principal objectives of the Gospel of John is "to establish the relation between the religion of the primeval Christian present time and the historical life of Jesus." As the religious life of the first Christians was concentrated mainly in Baptism and Communion, it will be possible to find the traces of both sacraments again and again, in the stories too.² Tertullian already noticed the

ισόθεος als ehrendes Prädikat für hervorragende Sterbliche (Wetst). Natürlich wäre auch nach griech. Anschauung die Aussage Joh. 5, 17 ein Wahnwitz."

¹ See STÄHLIN, TWNT, III, p. 343 ff., for the concepts ἴσος and ἰσότης, equality, identity. The reproach by the Jews, Jn. 5 : 18, was caused not only by the fact that Jesus called God "my Father:" "sondern auch in der damit verbundenen Äusserung, in der Jesus sich selbst dem göttlichen Gesetzgeber und sein Handeln dem Handeln Gottes gleichgestellt hatte." . . . ἴσος drückt in J 5, 18 weder Vergleich noch Identität, sondern Würde-, Willens- und Wesensgleichheit aus, das, wofür später mit dem Begriff ὁμοούσιος gekämpft wurde" (p. 353).

² CULLMANN, Urchristentum u. Gottesdienst. Chapter II deals with "Johannes-evangelium und urchristlicher Gottesdienst," pp. 33-77. Cullmann differs entirely from R. Bultmann, who thinks that the Gospel of John does not contain evidence of the slightest interest in the sacraments—see for instance his Evangelium des Johannes, p. 360. Cullmann believes that in many accounts the figures of Baptism and Communion may be perceived. The Fourth Gospel was therefore written from a given religious point of view, and the subject-matter chosen accordingly. "Es wäre nun allerdings verkehrt, zu meinen, der Evangelist habe von diesem Interesse aus die Tatsachen als solche nicht als historisch angesehen. Eine derartige Behauptung würde dem Wesen des vierten Evangeliums ebensowenig gerecht wie die gegenteilige, die jenes Gegenwartsinteresse bestreiten wollte" (p. 34).

baptismal element in the story of the healing of the paralytic at Bethesda, and this, says CULLMANN, is not "allegorical arbitrariness."¹ Jesus Christ takes the place of the angel who disturbed the water. In the forgiveness of sins, Jn. 5 : 14-16, the Evangelist "definitely" has in mind "the idea of that other water." Jesus' words to the healed man; "sin no more, lest a worse thing come unto thee," remind us of the forgiveness of sins received in baptism.²

We also find that DODD has a particular point of view. The fourth Gospel is a theological work set up in the form of a Gospel.³ One of the leading ideas in this Gospel is symbolism. Concepts such as water, wine and bread play a prominent part among the symbols, and also with regard to the sacraments, although the author does not say so in so many words.⁴ Now in the form of these symbols the contrast between the Law and the word of Jesus Christ is demonstrated: Christ is the "true" vine, He is the "true" bread, He is the "living" water!⁵ The story of the healing of the paralytic at Bethesda speaks of water that brings healing, but the paralytic has obtained no relief therefrom for thirty-eight years! "There lies the healing water, but the cripple remains unhealed: so the Torah promised life to man, but the Gospel tradition knew of 'publicans and sinners' for whom

¹ CULLMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 58 f. Reference is made to Tertullian, *De Baptismo*, cap. 5. Cullmann points to the same interpretation in Adalbert Merx, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, 1911, and Albert Schweitzer, *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, 1930.

² CULLMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 60. "Wir werden daran erinnert, dass im Urchristentum auch die Sündenvergebung, die in der Taufe erfolgt, die Aufforderung, nicht mehr zu sündigen, in sich schliesst (Röm. 6) und dass die nach der Taufe begangenen Sünden schlimmere Folgen haben (Hebr. 6, 4 ff. und 10, 26)."

³ DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 444, beginning of the Appendix: "It will have become clear that I regard the Fourth Gospel as being in its essential character a theological work, rather than a history. Nevertheless, the writer has chosen to set forth his theology under the literary form of a 'Gospel,' a form created by Christianity for its own proper purposes." The "revelation" is, however, "an historical revelation. It follows that it is important for the evangelist that what he narrates happened."

⁴ DODD, *op. cit.*, p. 138: "In considering the background, however, we must give full weight to the use of water and of bread and wine in the primitive Christian sacraments. It was this which made these two symbols inevitable ones for the evangelist, whatever enrichment of content they may have received from diverse sources. He has not chosen to speak directly about the sacraments, but for the Christian reader the allusions are inescapable."

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 83: "Not the Torah, but Christ, is the way to Life. Not 'words of Torah,' but His words are life (VI, 63). This contrast of the Torah and the incarnate Word is one of the governing ideas of the gospel, appearing in various symbolic forms." The Talmud has "the bread of the torah," "the water of the torah" and "the wine of the torah," but Christ brought all these "in truth."

it did nothing: the sick who needed a physician (Mark. ii. 16-17). Of them the cripple of Bethesda may serve as representative." Though the Law might show the way to life, the will and the power to live were given solely in the words of Jesus Christ.¹

We merely wished to draw attention to the views of Cullmann and Dodd, representatives of contemporary interpretation of the fourth Gospel. It is not possible here to go more deeply into their ideas, which concern the whole of the Gospel of John. As we have remarked on several occasions, we ourselves hold the opinion that the greatest possible care should be taken with the symbolic explanation, whether this is applied incidentally or practised systematically, even if such an explanation, supported by many kinds of "material" and compelling by skilful argumentation, seems not implausible at first sight.

¹ Op. cit., p. 319 f. DODD argues as follows: "The man might have been healed long ago, perhaps, if he had stepped down into the pool. Precisely; and that is why the first word of Jesus is, 'Have you the will to become a healthy man'? The reply is a feeble excuse. The man has not the will. The law might show the way of life; it was powerless to create the will to live. The will to live, together with the power to life, is given in the word of Christ."

IV. THE HEALING OF THE LEPERS

Those who were healed by Jesus also included a number of lepers. The Synoptists refer to a surprising case, whilst Luke separately reports the healing of ten lepers.¹ It is striking that the fourth Gospel makes no reference to the healing of lepers, whilst there is nothing more said about these patients in the other books of the New Testament either.

The way in which the Evangelists speak of leprosy reveals that this disease was not only serious, but also greatly feared. When He sent forth the twelve disciples, Jesus mentioned lepers by name: "cleans the lepers," Mt. 10 : 8. In the message which Jesus sent to John the Baptist when the latter was in prison, John's attention was drawn among other things to the cleansing of lepers, Mt. 11 : 5, Lk. 7 : 22. During the address that Jesus gave in the synagogue at Nazareth, the wrath of those present was aroused when He spoke of the cleansing of Naaman the Syrian by the prophet Eliseus (Elisha) whilst there were many lepers in Israel in the days of Eliseus, Lk. 4 : 27. In the house of Simon the leper Jesus was anointed with precious ointment of spikenard, Mt. 26 : 6, 7, Mk. 14 : 3.

The question which has been put countless times already and which must again be raised here is this: does the leprosy referred to in the Old and the New Testament correspond in all cases to what we understand by the term leprosy nowadays? Many consider the answer to this question problematical, and the matter will arise on a number of occasions in the course of our investigation. The following aspects require attention in our study:

- (a) Medical description of leprosy.
- (b) Description of leprosy in the Old Testament.
- (c) Treatment of leprosy in former times and among primitive peoples.
- (d) The healing of a leper.
- (e) The healing of the ten lepers.

¹ Mt. 8 : 1-4; Mk. 1 : 40-45; Lk. 5 : 12-16. Lk. 17 : 11-19, the ten lepers

(a) *Medical description of leprosy*

It seems desirable to begin with the medical aspects of the disease, so that we shall have comparative material available for the further sections.

Leprosy is described as a chronic infectious disease of man, caused by bacillus leprae.¹ The origin of the disease is lost in Antiquity; the oldest accounts have come down to us from India.² Right up to the last century, and even in this one, leprosy has been confused with other skin diseases. Many leproseries in Europe were in fact nothing more than dermatological clinics, according to SIMONS.³ In general infection occurs in youth. It is still unknown how the infection comes about; in any case direct and intimate contact is required.⁴ The disease begins with an invasion period, during

¹ CAROL, *Leerboek der Huidziekten*, p. 429... According to CAROL, in Antiquity Psora (= an itching eruption) and Psoriasis (= a peeling eruption) were not kept strictly apart. "Psora, alphos, lichen and lepra meant an accumulation on the skin of all kinds of morbid products, lichen (leichen = to spread) and lepra (lepein = to peel off) being used for the dry accumulations and psora more for moist, suppurating accumulations. Whilst lepra and lichen alluded more to scales and nodules, psora referred more to a moist, pustulate eruption; alphos doubtless referred to white accumulations... It can no longer be properly investigated what these terms exactly meant in former times. Our leprosy would formerly have been called lepra arabum or lepra judaeorum (also elephantiasis Graecorum s. judaei); lepra alphoides alphos or alphosis was perhaps our psoriasis. Lepros meant peeling off, lepein = to peel off: (lepos = husk, scale or flake)" (p. 49). For the names given to leprosy by all kinds of peoples, see the detailed work by ZAMBACO, *La Lèpre*, p. 1. RUTGERS, *Lepre en Tuberculose*, p. 1, states that there have been periods in history in which leprosy and tuberculosis were identified with one another. In the Middle Ages leprosy was also taken for a form of syphilis, whilst Boerhave (according to Danielssen) established a connection between leprosy and serious scurvy. Armauer Hansen discovered the leprosy bacillus in 1874; shortly afterwards, in 1882, Robert Koch discovered the tuberculosis bacillus.

² SIMONS in "Dermatologie der Tropen," Ch. VIII, *Lepre*, p. 174. C. FLANDIN, H. RABEAU and A. BASSET, who in "Traité de Médecine," Tome II, 1948, pp. 333-379, are responsible for the chapter "La Lèpre," state as their opinion: "Connue depuis la plus haute antiquité, la lèpre semble avoir son origine dans l'Inde" (p. 333). Cf. ZAMBACO, *La Lèpre*, pp. 37 and 362.

³ SIMONS, *op. cit.*, p. 174.

⁴ SIMONS, *op. cit.*, p. 181: "How infection occurs is an open question, the answer to which can be approached by elimination." There must be close and lengthy contact (kissing, coitus, infection spread by coughing or sneezing; leprous parents and children sleeping in the same bed). Worthy of mention is Simons' following statement: "In Surinam the evening Communion service in the churches is held in the mornings or afternoons to prevent patients who have freedom of movement from secretly attending the service and drinking out of the communal chalice" (p. 206). In his study "Bijgeloof en Godsziekte," SIMONS mentions among the metamorphosed demons in the Atlantic region a demon called fio fio in the

which the sick person feels generally unwell, and all kinds of disorders occur, but it may take years (two to eight years or longer) before the symptoms emerge clearly. "Gradually the first exanthema occurs in the form of spots, bright red, bluish and brownish red, sometimes quite flat, sometimes raised slightly above the skin, differing greatly in number, size and distribution."¹ Clinically a distinction is made between two forms of leprosy, viz. *lepra tuberosa*, in which the symptoms appear in the form of nodules in the skin, and *lepra nervosa* or *maculo-anaesthetica*, in which the nervous system is attacked in particular. A third form also exists, *lepra mixta*, in which a mixture of the first two forms occurs.² The patient who is attacked by *lepra nervosa* is unlikely, or hardly likely, to infect others.

Up to now it has not proved possible to find an effective cure for leprosy, although promising results have already been achieved with new drugs.³

The area in which leprosy is still encountered today is relatively large. The total number of lepers in the world may be estimated at four to five million.⁴

In medical circles it is in general not considered probable that the Biblical term leprosy meant the same as what is understood by the same word nowadays. We have already mentioned CAROL's remark that it is no longer feasible to investigate what the various names once meant.⁵ SENG is of the opinion that leprosy in the Bible "certainly does not" mean our leprosy.⁶

bed-bug. SIMONS does not exclude the possibility that leprosy is transmitted by an insect. "The future will have to show whether the theory that leprosy is spread by the bed-bug will have to be relegated to the land of fables together with the belief in *fio fio*" (p. 32). LUTZ, *Lehrbuch der Haut- und Geschlechtskrankheiten*, p. 488. ZAMBACO, *La Lèpre*, p. 705: "La contagiosité de la lèpre est la pomme de discorde entre les dermatologistes et même les léprologues."

¹ LUTZ, *Lehrbuch der Haut- und Geschlechtskrankheiten*, p. 486.

² See KOUWENAAR, article on leprosy in the Winkler Prins Encyclopedia, Vol. 12, 1951.

³ Use is still made of chaulmoogra oil, known for centuries, which can be swallowed or injected. Nowadays many new preparations, sulpha drugs, are used. SIMONS, *op. cit.*, p. 215, says optimistically: "the saying 'once a leper, always a leper,' is out of date." There are criteria of healing.

⁴ See KOUWENAAR, article on leprosy in the Winkler Prins Encyclopedia. During the Graeco-Roman period of civilization leprosy entered Southern Europe, and about the year 1000 much of Europe was infected by it. In Europe leprosy is still found in Norway, Spain and above all in S. E. Europe and E. Europe. Large leprosy centres are to be found in China, S. E. Asia, S. America and Central Africa. Atjeh, the Batak lands and the Moluccas are the main centres in Indonesia. There are many lepers in Surinam . . . ZAMBACO, *La Lèpre*, gives an extensive survey.

⁵ See p. 465

⁶ SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 18. SIMONS, *op. cit.*,

These views relate in particular to the interpretation of Lev. 13 and 14, in which the task of the priest with regard to the diagnosis of leprosy and pronouncing the victim "clean" or "unclean" is described in meticulous detail. Now PREUSS has subjected these chapters to a medical exegesis, and this doctor is of the opinion that Lev. 13 is in fact concerned with leprosy in the correct sense of the word. According to PREUSS there are only two dreaded chronic diseases which qualify, leprosy and syphilis. It cannot have been syphilis, and so it must have been leprosy.¹ When opinions vary so greatly among experts, what is the layman to think?

p. 175, says: "In the translation of the Bible the word *zara'ath* was everywhere translated by the Greek word 'leprosy' (in fact only 'scaling'), thus giving it an all-embracing meaning. One of the leprosies was for instance called *lepra albos* (psoriasis), another *lepra asturica* (pellagra). Yet another (which we now call leprosy) was called *lepra arabum*, etc."

¹ PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 369 ff.: "Somit stimmen wir der Meinung, die bis vor einigen Jahrzehnten fast alle Forscher vertraten, bei, das unter *çarâ'ath* der *Aussatz* zu verstehen sei." Strangely enough Preuss weakens his position by immediately going on to say: "Dass dieser Beweis alles andere als zwingend ist, gebe ich ohne weiteres zu; denn es ist nicht zu beweisen, dass nicht auch Träger von irgendwelchen Hautkrankheiten, die nach *unserer* Auffassung harmloser Natur sind, isoliert wurden" (p. 372). He says in conclusion: "Die Auffassung der *çarâ'ath* als *Aussatz* ist also höchstens eine Wahrscheinlichkeitsdiagnose; sie teilt dieses Los allerdings mit einer grossen Anzahl von Krankheitsnamen aus dem Altertum. Am vorsichtigsten wird man gehen, wenn man den Begriff *çarâ'ath* als 'Sammelnamen' auffasst" (p. 373). We also find this idea of a collective name in CASTIGLIONI, *A History of Medicine*, p. 73, and in LINDEBOOM, *Geschiedenis der geneeskunde*, p. 34 f., who envisages a "group of skin diseases." EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*. Ebstein is of the opinion: "dass unter der *Zaraath*, dem biblischen *Aussatz*, auch Fälle von dem *Aussatz* im modernen Sinne, d.h. von *Lepra*, schon damals und in noch weiter zurückliegender alttestamentlicher Zeit vorgekommen sind" (p. 38). He recalls the opinion of the Norwegians Danielssen and Boeck: "Danielssen und Boeck geben an, dass sie trotz der nicht gerade genauen Symptomatologie, welche wir von dem *Aussatz* der Juden überkommen haben, doch nicht daran zweifeln dürfen, dass derselbe mit der *Elephantiasis Graecorum* identisch sei, wenn man bedenke, dass diese *Elephantiasis* in Ägypten noch endemisch sei" (p. 39). Danielssen and Boeck are of the opinion that we are concerned in the New Testament with the same disease as in the Old Testament, unlike Adams, *Observations on Morbid Poisons*, London, 1807, according to whom it is not certain whether the leprosy of the New Testament is identical with the leprosy of the Jews. There is much difference of opinion on this point (p. 40 f.). GISPEN, *Het boek Leviticus*, p. 200 ff., reports a controversy between two doctors of more recent date. Dr. K. P. C. A. Gramberg (*Geneeskundig Tijdschrift voor Ned. Indië*, 1937, p. 2203 ff.), thinks that the leprosy of the Bible must be regarded as a purely religious concept. It was imposed by God as a punishment to bring about atonement and repentance. It cannot be identified with modern leprosy, Hansen's disease. Dr. A. C. Drogendijk (*Geneeskundige Gids*, 1938, pp. 824-834 and 850-855) is opposed to this point of view. In his opinion Biblical leprosy is not a

And yet the layman cannot and will not fail to form a certain opinion, and he will do this not only by weighing the medical arguments pro and con to the best of his ability, but also, and in particular, by consulting Biblical data. When Lev. 14 ends with the words: "This is the law for all manner of plague of leprosy, and scall, And for the leprosy of a garment, and of a house, And for a rising, and for a scab, and for a bright spot: To teach when it is unclean, and when it is clean: this is the law of leprosy," verses 54-57, then in our opinion it is most obvious to interpret the word leprosy as a collective noun, as PREUSS also suggests by way of precaution. We cannot see why there should be objections from the side of theology to the opinion of present-day leprologists that the Biblical concept of leprosy is not identical with the modern one. This view at the same time implies that both Jesus and the disciples healed people who suffered from different forms of skin disease which are unknown to us and will most probably remain so, whilst in our opinion there can be no doubt that those healed also included Jews who had been stricken with the plague of leprosy, interpreted in the modern sense of the word, the *lepra arabum* or *judaeorum*.

(b) *Description of leprosy in the Old Testament*

Leprosy is the only disease to which very special attention is devoted in the Old Testament with reference to ritual life. This demonstrates that leprosy was a very common disease in Palestine.¹

Without going into details, we shall now give a description of the symptoms as they are stated in Lev. 13 and 14.

Lev. 13 begins with the regulation that someone displaying certain symptoms, viz. a swelling, scab or bright spot: "and it be in the skin of his flesh like the plague of leprosy," had to be brought before the priest to be examined.² The priest was therefore considered to

purely religious concept. Drogendijk leaves open the question whether our leprosy is meant. They are different skin diseases. Gispen is of the opinion that Drogendijk is closer to the truth and that those exegetes are correct who think that *zāra'ath* can in general be identified with what is now called leprosy.

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, II, p. 745.

² PREUSS, op. cit., p. 375, remarks that the patient has to be "brought": "da er freiwillig schwerlich kommen wird" . . . The disease was by then already manifest to all . . . The word **צִרְעָת** is derived from **צרע** and probably means: to be struck by God. Some prefer to derive it from **ורע**, to sow. They have in mind a dissemination on the skin, see PREUSS, op. cit., p. 373. The three symptoms mentioned in Lev. 13 : 2: a rising (**שֹׁאֵת**), a raised spot, a thickening), a scab

be an expert: he acted according to circumstances. Verses 4-8 describe the regulations regarding examination and treatment. The priest may either pronounce the patient "unclean" or isolate him for two successive periods of seven days. If the result proves favourable after the second examination, he is pronounced clean: "it is but a scab."¹ But if it proves unfavourable: "then the priest shall pronounce him unclean: it is a leprosy."

A description follows in verses 9-17 of the white "rising" in the skin. If it is "an old leprosy" the victim is not isolated: "for he is unclean," verses 9-11.²

So far the description was understandable, but the part that now comes, verses 12-17, has never been satisfactorily solved by anyone. What are we to think of a sick person, covered entirely with leprosy, being pronounced "clean?" Old writers sometimes speak of an acute leprosy in which the whole skin suddenly seemed to have a white colour. PREUSS is of the opinion that we can only pronounce a non liquet here.³ Verses 18-23 describe how the priest must act if a "white rising, or a bright spot, white, and somewhat reddish"

(ספּפּחַת, ringworm of the scalp, favus) and bright spot (בְּהֶרֶת, a white, shiny spot) might, according to Preuss, point to three forms of leprosy. "Es ist sehr naheliegend, hier drei Formen der Lepra zu finden, in der bahéreth die Fleckenlepra, in der šēeth den Knollenaussatz und in der sappachath die von Willan als Lepra vulgaris bezeichnete Schuppenflechte, die Psoriasis. Dann wäre also çarâ'ath ein 'Sammelname' . . ." (p. 374). In the words "plague of leprosy," נגע צרעת, touch, strike, נגע, refers according to Preuss to the old belief that a man is struck by an agent outside his body and becomes ill. "Daraus entwickelt sich dann unsere Auffassung von den kontagiösen, von einem Menschen auf den anderen übertragenen Krankheit" (p. 374) . . . In the Mishna the term צרעת is no longer used (see PREUSS, p. 382), but in the Nega'im tractate a distinction is made between two main groups, viz. the שֵׁאת and the בְּהֶרֶת, each of which again subdivide into two kinds. A number of rabbis have further extended the subdivision, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 746.

¹ Lev. 13 : 6 . . . Scab, מְסִפָּחַת, an eruption of a benign nature.

² See PREUSS, op. cit., p. 377. According to Preuss, a "Lepraknoten" is meant here.

³ PREUSS, p. 377 f. One might envisage vitiligo (a skin disease with white spots with a dark edge, on which the hair is colourless) or psoriasis, but there are too many objections to this. "Wir kommen also als ehrliche Kritiker über ein non liquet bei dieser Bibelstelle nicht heraus oder zu deutsch: wir können sie nicht erklären." GISPEN, Het boek Leviticus, p. 206, with reference to verses 12 and 13. The symptoms are reminiscent of leucoderma, white leprosy. "From the following verses it becomes evident that merely the growth of proud flesh made the infected person unclean. This gave rise to the supposition that this was real leprosy. Leucoderma is not dangerous."

appears in the place of a healed boil. In this case too the priest may pronounce the man "clean" or not.¹ The priest will act in the same way if the sick person has a burn of suspicious appearance, verses 24-28. Leprosy can also occur on the head and in the beard; it then manifests itself in the form of "yellow thin hair," verses 29-39. If someone becomes bald without further symptoms he is "clean," but if a "white reddish sore" appears on the bald head, there is the possibility of leprosy being present, verses 40-44.² Up to this point the leprosy related to man. In the following section a number of regulations are given which have to be observed when the "plague of leprosy" is revealed in clothing and leatherwork, verses 47-59.

Lev. 14 contains the regulations relating to the cleansing sacrifices which must serve to purify of sin the man pronounced "clean," and the complicated task which the priest has to perform in this respect: "and the priest shall make an atonement for him before the Lord," verse 18. The cleansing of the poor is specified separately, verses 21-23. The law on leprosy is concluded by a series of regulations applying to a leprous house, viz. if it is found that "the plague be in the walls of the house with hollow strakes, greenish or reddish, which in sight are lower than the wall," verse 37.

If the leprosy is malignant, the house shall be pronounced unclean and demolished, and all the rubble shall be taken out of the town and deposited at an unclean place. However, if the house is healed of its plague, the prescribed sacrifices must be made to cleanse it.

The pitiful state of the leper is described in dramatic fashion in Lev. 13 : 45 ff.: "And the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and his head bare, and he shall put a covering upon his upper lip, and shall cry, Unclean, unclean. All the days wherein the plague shall be in him he shall be defiled; he is unclean: he shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be."³ This text gives rise to the further consideration of a number of details.

¹ יִצְחָק, boil, probably means eczema, according to PREUSS, p. 378. Cf. p. 395 ff. on "Der schechin Ägyptens." See Ex. 9 : 9-12, which speaks of "a boil breaking forth with blains."

² PREUSS, op. cit., p. 380: "Das Krankheitsbild würde am meisten an Grind (Favus) erinnern."

³ PREUSS, op. cit., p. 386: "Die Verhüllung des Mundes bis über den Lippenbart hatte nach manchen Erklärern (Ibn Esra) den Zweck, andere vor einer Schädigung durch den Hauch seines Mundes zu schützen." A man had to let his hair hang loose, a woman had not, see Nu. 5 : 18 . . . "Targ Jerusch I Lev. 13, 45: Die Kleider des Aussätzigen, an welchem die Plage sich findet, sollen eingerissen

In the first place we are struck by the fact that the priest was given very great powers indeed. For his examination and decision determined the further fate of the sick person. True, every Israelite was permitted to inspect the leprosy — except that on his own body and on that of a blood-relation — but only the priest was allowed to pass the decisive judgment.¹

PREUSS may remark that probably a class of advisers or specialists in the field of leprosy had formed, experts who diagnosed the disease, but the final decision rested with the priest.²

In further regulations the time and place of the examination were ultimately specified, and also the bodily attitude which the patient suspected of leprosy had to assume during the examination, so that this could be held as meticulously as possible.³

The ritual for the cleansing prescribed in Lev. 14 : 4-7 was worked out carefully and in detail, as were the regulations which the sick person had to observe during the period of waiting, verses 8-9, and the cleansing on the eighth day, verses 10-20.⁴

In the second place we are struck by the requirement of isolation as such. In our days it is a general custom to isolate infectious and contagious diseases solely for socio-hygienic reasons. However, these reasons are not applicable here: it was religious considerations that led to the regulation.

The children of Israel, as the people of Yahweh, were a holy people, chosen and set apart from all other peoples. They therefore wished strictly to maintain their holiness within their own ranks and to defend it against the surrounding peoples; everything relating

sein, u. sein Haupt lasse das Haar wild wachsen, u. an den Grenzen gehe er einher, u. seinen Lippenbart verhülle er, u. wie ein Trauernder sei er gekleidet" (STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 755 f., who states further references) . . . "S Lv. 13, 45 (261a): Unrein, unrein! rufe er. Er sagt: Halte dich fern! . . . Targ. Onk z. St.: Verunreinigt euch nicht, verunreinigt euch nicht! soll er rufen" (STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 756, where there are yet more references).

¹ Neg. III, 1: "All can contract leprosy uncleanness, except a heathen and a resident alien. All ¹) are qualified to inspect leprosy signs, but only a priest may declare them unclean or clean. He ²) is told ³) 'say: unclean' and he repeats 'unclean,' or 'say: clean,' and he repeats 'clean'" (ed. Epstein, transl. W. Slotki). Even a mentally diseased priest could pronounce judgment, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 757.

² PREUSS, op. cit., p. 385.

³ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 758 f.

⁴ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, pp. 759-763.

¹) Even an unlearned priest under the guidance of an Israelite scholar.

²) The unlearned priest.

³) By the Israelite scholar who accompanies him . . .

to a strange cult was unclean.¹ This pursuit of purity, which comprised cult and ethos² — it is understandable that, if too marked an emphasis was laid on the cultic and ritual side of purity, tensions occurred and opposition was aroused among those (such as the prophets) who wanted to stress the religious and ethical side — gradually lost its religious impetus.

Both the cultic and the ethical side acquired a static character and became inflexible. The whole of religious and civil life was as it were packed in a bundle of legal regulations; uncleanness was divided into several categories; with scrupulous care it was specified what was unclean and what was not, and what caused uncleanness, where one could come and go and where not.³ It is against this wide religious background of Israel as the people of Yahweh, as a holy people, that the regulations concerning leprosy must be viewed. The leper was not permitted to enter any house.⁴ A chance encounter between a leper and a non-leper might contaminate the latter.⁵ Such rigorous views and provisions could not but, by their very nature, bring many practical difficulties in their train. However, it is evident from the writings of the rabbis that milder practices were sometimes applied. For instance, lepers were allowed to live unhampered wherever they chose, except in Jerusalem and cities which had been walled since

¹ See MEYER, TWNT, III, p. 419.

² See for instance Lev. 17-26; Deu. 21-26 . . . HULST, *Het karakter van de cultus in Deuteronomium*; Ch. VIII: "De cultus en het sociale leven."

³ MEYER, TWNT, III, p. 421 ff., gives a survey of "Die kultische Unreinheit" and "Die kultische Reinigung," with textual material from rabbinical literature.

⁴ Kelim I, 4: "On a higher plane than the Zabah is the leper, for he conveys uncleanness¹) by entering into a house" (ed. Epstein; transl. W. Slotki).

¹) To men and vessels . . .

Neg. XIII, 11: "If a leper entered a house all vessels in it, even to the height of the roof beams, become unclean. R. Simeon ruled: only to a height of four cubits¹). Vessels²) become unclean forthwith. R. Judah ruled: only if the leper stayed there as much time as is required for the lighting of a lamp."

¹) Any vessel above this height remains clean.

²) To the height of the beams according to the first Tanna and to the height of four cubits according to R. Simeon . . . For further references see STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 753.

⁵ Neg. XIII, 7: "If an unclean man¹) stood under a tree and a clean man passed by, the latter becomes unclean. If a clean man stood under a tree and an unclean one passed by, the former remains clean. If the latter stood still, the former becomes unclean."

¹) afflicted with leprosy . . .

There are a few other texts which say the same thing, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 753.

ancient times.¹ In connection with the requirement that lepers be isolated, it may be asked whether there were leproseries in Palestine. Attempts have been made to deduce this from 2 Ch. 26 : 21, where it is said of King Uzziah, a leper, that he "dwelt in a several house, being a leper; for he was cut off from the house of the Lord." It cannot be said for sure whether this "several house" should be taken to mean a leproseries.² Since not a word is said in either the Bible or the Talmud about leper colonies or institutions for lepers, it may be assumed that these did not exist, even in Jesus' day.

The third point to be considered is the question of aetiology. It is less than a century ago that the mycobacterium leprae was discovered as the natural pathogen of leprosy, and it is understandable that affliction by so dreaded a disease as leprosy was in olden times ascribed to supernatural causes. In general leprosy was regarded as a direct punishment by God, received for committing some serious sin or the other. Literature lists a strange variety of sins: blasphemy, overweening pride, sexual misbehaviour, bloodshed, theft, false witness, robbery, perjury, breaking the peace, envy, habitual lying, etc.³ But, although the punishing hand of God was envisaged here, it was nevertheless believed that it was not God's intention merely to punish the sinner. Leprosy was meant as a terrible form of chastisement to induce men to repent and better themselves.⁴ God afflicted

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 751 f., believes that the view of Flavius Josephus, *Contra Apion*, I, 31, that a leper could live neither in a town nor in a village is in conflict with what is handed down in rabbinical literature . . . Lepers were given an opportunity to attend services. *Neg. XIII*, 12: "If he ¹) enters a synagogue, a partition ten handbreadths high and four cubits wide must be made for him ²). He must enter first and come out last ³)." . . .

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 755. It may, however, also mean "House of isolation." Cf. 2 Ki. 15 : 5, 6, where Uzziah has the name of Azariah. The exact translation is uncertain . . . CURTIS, *Chronicles*. RUDOLPH, *Chronikbücher*, gives as translation: "Haus der Freiheit," as euphemism for: "Haus der Absperrung."

³ PREUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 388 f. . . . See STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 747 ff., where many examples may be found.

⁴ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 750 . . . As regards the "chastisements from love," i.e. as a trial and purification, and chastisement as punishment, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 193 ff. ¹) A leper.

²) One of smaller measurements constitutes no valid protection for the remainder of the synagogue.

³) Since otherwise, should he happen to stand still in his passage from the door to the partition, he would render the people in the synagogue unclean . . .

A woman was allowed a divorce if her husband became a leper. If she stayed with him, sexual relations were forbidden, but there was no unanimity on this regulation. Despite a number of alleviating circumstances the fate of the leper was a frightful one.

men with leprosy, but it was also He who brought healing if the victim did in fact reform.¹ Opinions differ as to whether someone who was healed of leprosy could again be afflicted by this disease: according to some rabbis this was possible, according to others it was not.²

It emerges from the great number of precisely formulated regulations that Israel tried at all times to protect itself ritually against the great evil of skin diseases, of which leprosy was the most malignant and disastrous form. It is certainly striking that, among a number of provisions in which all kinds of standards are laid down for a good communal life of the people of Israel, the following urgent advice appears: "Take heed in the plague of leprosy, that thou observe diligently, and do according to all that the priests the Levites shall teach you: as I commanded them, so ye shall observe to do. Remember what the Lord thy God did unto Miriam by the way, after that ye were come forth out of Egypt," Deu. 24 : 8, 9. The cult is thus made subservient to the social ethos here.

We shall now briefly consider the cases mentioned in the Old Testament. We can subdivide these into miracles or signs and ordinary cases. Among the signs which Moses had to perform to identify himself as the envoy of God, the first to be described is the sign of the leprous hand. When Moses put his hand into his bosom the first time, it became "leprous as snow;" when he repeated this action, it once again became: "as his other flesh," Ex. 4 : 6, 7. Nothing may be deduced from this account regarding the symptoms. For Moses was not afflicted with leprosy as a disease, but a symptom of leprosy partially manifested itself on him for a moment. The term "as snow" occurs in two other cases.³ In Nu. 5 : 2 the "lepers" are listed together with other cultically "unclean" persons who at God's command have to be put out of the camp.

In the case of Miriam (Nu. 12 : 1-16) we are also concerned with a sign. "And the cloud departed from off the tabernacle; and, behold,

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 751.

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 761.

³ In Nu. 12 : 10 and in 2 Ki. 5 : 27. PREUSS, op. cit., p. 377, comments on this: "In mehreren Erzählungen (die aber nicht Gesetzesvorschriften sind), nennt die Bibel die Betroffenen 'aussätzig wie Schnee,' und aus diesem Vergleich in Verbindung mit der Tatsache, dass die Erkrankten nach kurzer Zeit geheilt waren, hat man geschlossen, dass es sich in diesen Fällen nicht um Aussatz, sondern um eine über den ganzen Körper verbreitete Schuppenflechte (Psoriasis) gehandelt habe." Preuss rightly goes on to say: "Allein alle diese drei Fälle werden ausdrücklich als Wunder, also als Ausnahmen von der Norm berichtet und können daher keinesfalls hier als Beweis herangezogen werden."

Miriam became leprous, white as snow: and Aaron looked upon Miriam, and, behold, she was leprous," verse 10. At God's command Miriam had to be shut out of the camp for seven days, after which she was permitted to rejoin the people.¹ In the account of Naaman, captain of the host, we are confronted with an actual case of sickness, 2 Ki. 5 : 1-27. It is possible that this was merely some persistent skin disease, but the contents of the vivid and detailed account justify the supposition that this was a case of leprosy in the modern sense.

The command to Naaman to wash himself in the Jordan should not be interpreted as meaning that the water had healing power, but as implying an immediate healing by God.² Naaman wanted to reward his benefactor, but Elisha rejected any form of reward. But when Elisha's servant Gehazi had induced Naaman to give him a number of valuable presents, Elisha pronounced a harsh verdict on his servant. "The leprosy therefore of Naaman shall cleave unto thee, and unto thy seed for ever. And he went out from his presence a leper as white as snow," verse 27. The natural explanation which PREUSS suggests is certainly disputable. He believes this to be a case of direct infection, but a direct punitive miracle is reported: the man left Elisha "a leper as white as snow."³ The next account, which describes the experiences of four male lepers, recalls the stern regulations of isolation: the lepers were "at the entering in of the gate," 2 Ki. 7 : 1-11.⁴ The last reference to a case of leprosy as

¹ PREUSS, op. cit., p. 377, makes the following shrewd comment on this case: "Zudem hätte doch Mirjam, falls ihre Erkrankung die hier gezeichnete universelle *çarâ'ath* gewesen wäre, sofort für rein erklärt werden müssen, in Wirklichkeit wird sie aber auf Befehl Gottes sieben Tage eingeschlossen!" Preuss says this with regard to the symptoms of leprosy described in Lev. 13 : 12-16.

² PREUSS, op. cit., p. 386, remarks that in the Bible bathing in the Jordan is certainly not regarded as: "Heilmittel im natürlichen Sinne . . . Und wenn die Jordanbäder an sich wirklich einen solchen Einfluss auf den Aussatz gehabt hätten, so wäre er wahrscheinlich nicht bloss dem Propheten bekannt gewesen." Cf. pp. 512 and 625. KAISER, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit u. Israel*, p. 100: "Der resignierte Vergleich des Jordans mit den zwei damaskenischen Flüssen durch Naaman soll sicher den Gedanken an eine selbstständige Wirkung des Jordanwassers ausschliessen." RENGSTORF, *TWNT*, VI, p. 611. Nowhere in the O.T. is there any mention of: "einer besonderen Dignität des Jordanwassers," though a reference is made somewhere (b Ket 77b) to the water of the Euphrates as being beneficial against leprosy, see p. 600.

³ PREUSS, op. cit., p. 389: "Für die Entstehung des Aussatzes bei Gehazi, dem Diener Elis, liegt uns eine Erklärung sehr nahe." Gehazi receives the silver and the garments, and becomes a leper. "Natürlich denken wir an eine direkte Übertragung."

⁴ PREUSS, op. cit., p. 364, places the occurrence recounted in 2 Ki. 7 as such

an immediate punishment for pride and the infringement of cultic laws is in 2 Ch. 26 : 16-23. It concerns King Uzziah. The scene is described in truly dramatic fashion. Whilst the king stood in the temple, a censer in his hand to burn incense, and raged at the priests, who in turn were outraged: "the leprosy even rose up in his forehead before the priests in the house of the Lord, from beside the incense altar," verse 19. Driven forth by the priests, and also in haste himself, the king left the temple. Until his death he lived "in a several house." He was buried "with his fathers in the field of the burial which belonged to the kings; for they said, He is a leper," verse 23.¹

Surveying the whole, we come to the conclusion that, of the seven cases of leprosy related in the Old Testament, four are ascribed to a direct intervention by God (Moses, Miriam, Gehazi and Uzziah), that two of the cases illustrate the practical application of the law on leprosy (Nu. 5 : 2; 2 Ki. 7 : 3), and that in three cases we are told of a direct healing by God (Moses, Miriam and Naaman. Actually one can hardly speak of a healing in the case of Moses, as this is a sign. It is nowhere stated whether Moses made use of it.)

(c) *Treatment of leprosy in former times and among primitive peoples*

Not only Israel but also the old civilized nations had to contend with the dreaded disease of leprosy. Its unknown origin, the dreadful process of the disease, its contagious nature, and the failure of all remedies could not but have an effect on the imagination and beliefs of these peoples. This is illustrated by strange theories about the origin of the disease and peculiar means of combating it.

There are various theories about the origin of leprosy. Often the cause is sought in the eating of certain foods, which were regarded as "forbidden" or not, i.e. in a material agent. Possible causes were thought to be meat, fish, worms and fruit, whilst the "terephah belief" also plays an important part. According to Tacitus and Plutarch the Jews were forbidden to eat pork because this meat causes leprosy or furthers the disease respectively. PREUSS remarks that

under the heading of "Geisteskrankheiten" and describes it as: "einen Fall von Gehörshalluzinationen, mit Massensuggestion verbunden."

¹ For the "several house" see p. 473 . . . With reference to Uzziah's burial "in the *field* of the burial which belonged to the Kings," PREUSS, op. cit., p. 611, wonders whether there may have been separate burial grounds for lepers, as was the case for persons who had been executed. He thinks that this was not so. "Der Aussatz des Königs war unter so besonderen Umständen entstanden, dass auch noch die Bestattung eine Fortsetzung der Strafe sein konnte."

this view is supported neither by the Bible nor by the Talmud.¹ SIMONS recalls the "fish theory" of Hutchinson (1863). According to this theory, leprosy might be caused by the eating of bad fish.² The theory refers to bad fish, but as far as Israel is concerned the large-scale consumption of fish in Egypt has also been suggested, Nu. 11 : 5. It was believed that the Egyptians were spared from leprosy because they abhorred fish.³ On the west coast of Africa the Negroes believe that the disease is caused by boasi worms (called after the village of Boasi).⁴

In Surinam some believe that leprosy is caused by eating certain fruits, whilst the "terephah belief" is also encountered in this region. According to this belief the disease is caused by eating certain ritually forbidden foods: for certain foods are reserved for a deity. The "terephah" (treiphos, terefa, treife, treef = forbidden food) is usually discovered by a mother or aunt in a dream.⁵ All these theories are therefore based on the disease being caused by an agent that enters man from outside. In Talmudic literature there is a pronouncement in which leprosy is ascribed to plethora, an excessive fullness of blood: leprosy occurs when there is more blood than water in the body.⁶

We may make a distinction between two methods of combating leprosy. The first consists in killing (by means of burning or starving), expelling or isolating the victim.⁷ This method is thus simply

¹ PREUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 389.

² SIMONS, *op. cit.*, p. 178 f.

³ PREUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 389 f. Preuss rightly says that Nu. 11 : 5 refers to the monotony of the manna in the wilderness. "Übrigens ist die Fischtheorie des Aussatzes heute wohl allgemein aufgegeben."

⁴ SIMONS, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

⁵ SIMONS, *op. cit.*, p. 178.

⁶ Midr. Rabbah Lev. XV, 2: "and he meteth out the water by measure." Man is evenly balanced, half of him is water, and the other half is blood. When he is deserving the water does not exceed the blood, nor does the blood exceed the water; but when he sins, it sometimes happens that the water gains over the blood and then he becomes a sufferer from dropsy; at other times the blood gains over the water and he then becomes leprous" (transl. J. Israelstam).

⁷ See KOTY, *Die Behandlung der Alten u. Kranken b.d. Naturvölkern*, pp. 75, 121, 123. . . . Among the natives of Tahiti (Polynesia), on the other hand, lepers were venerated as sacred persons; they were the object of great reverence, whereas other incurables were cast out of the community or buried alive (p. 43). Koty also points to the "hard lot" of lepers in Israel (p. 184) . . . Expulsion is also referred to in HERODOTUS, *Historiae*, I, 138. When someone in Persia had "leprosy or white eruption," λέπρην ἢ λεύκην, he was not allowed to enter towns or mix with other Persians. It was said that such a person had sinned against the sun (φασὶ δὲ μιν ἐς τὸν ἥλιον ἀμαρτόντα τι ταῦτα εἶχειν).

directed towards maintaining and preserving the tribe and people. In the second method the disease as such is tackled. We may doubtless consider a humane and social motive to be present here as well.

Since a mysterious disease will yield only to mysterious forces, particularly efficacious means must be applied. A special agent in this category is blood, especially the blood of children. After a short but vivid description of the disease PLINY tells us how disastrous leprosy was for the people when a king was afflicted with it, since he then had to bathe in human blood.¹ There is a legend that Constantine the Great, when still a pagan, was plagued with leprosy. The priests of Jupiter Capitolinus advised him to bathe in the blood of children. Moved by the pitiful cries of the children, Constantine refused to apply this means. In a dream he was shown the way: he approached Pope Sylvester, was converted and, after baptism, was healed of his disease.²

During the Middle Ages the belief that human blood was the most effective means against leprosy was widely encountered. Parts of corpses, such as dead hands, were also claimed to have been of good service as a remedy.³

¹ PLINY, *Hist. nat.*, XXVI, V. "Diximus elephantiasim ante Pompei Magni aetatem non accidisse in Italia, et ipsam a facie saepius incipientem, in nare prima veluti lenticula, mox inarescente per totum corpus maculosa variis coloribus et inaequali cute, alibi crassa, alibi tenui, dura alibi ceu scabie aspera, ad postremum vero nigrescente et ad ossa carnes adprimente, intumescitibus digitis in pedibus manibusque. Aegypti peculiare hoc malum et, cum in reges incidisset, populus funebre, quippe in balineis solia temperabantur humano sanguine ad medicinam eam. et hic quidem morbus celeriter in Italia restinctus est, sicut et ille quem gemursam appellavere prisci inter digitos pedum nascentem, etiam nomine obliterato" ("I have said that leprosy did not occur in Italy before the time of Pompeius Magnus, and that though the plague usually begins on the face, a kind of freckle on the tip of the nose, yet presently the skin dries up over all the body, covered with spots of various colours, and uneven, in places thick, in others thin, in others hard as with rough itch-scab, finally however going black, and pressing the flesh on to the bones, while the toes and fingers swell up. This plague is native to Egypt. When kings were attacked, it was a deadly thing for the inhabitants because the tubs in the baths used to be prepared with warm human blood for its treatment. This disease indeed quickly died out in Italy, as also did that called by the ancients gemursa, which appeared between the toes, the very name being now obsolete").

² STRACK, *Das Blut im Glauben und Aberglauben der Menschheit*, p. 37 f. Richard III and Louis IX, who had both been attacked by leprosy, are also said to have bathed in the blood of children: see VAN ANDEL, *Klassieke Wondermiddelen*, p. 29.

³ STRACK, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-40. § 5, *Menschenblut heilt den Aussatz*. "Der bekannte Arzt Theophrastus Paracelsus von Hohenheim (1493-1541) nennt als Mittel gegen den Aussatz: dosis sanguinis humani, semel in mense in secunda

All that has been said so far about leprosy may make it clear what a deep physical and mental misery this disease brings in its train for the individual and the community. Only when we begin to realize this to some extent can we see in more than one respect the greatness and the significance of the coming and works of Jesus as the Saviour, in which His pity also went out to those suffering from leprosy or other frightful skin diseases.

(d) *The healing of a leper*

At the beginning of this chapter we listed the references to lepers in the Gospels. It may be derived from what has been said above that Simon "the leper" cannot be counted as a sufferer from leprosy, whilst Lazarus cannot be characterized as a leper either.¹

It is remarkable that two lamentable figures, Job in the Old Testament and Lazarus in the New Testament, who are both directly or indirectly connected with the disease leprosy, cannot either of them be regarded, according to various medical experts, as lepers!²

die post oppositionem. Noch der Züricher Professor und Stadtarzt Joh. v. Muralt verordnet im Hippocrates Helveticus, Basel 1692, 645 gegen Erbgrind Menschenblut" (p. 40) . . . "Grimm, Der arme Heinrich 177: Carpentier (v. miselli) führt aus einer Urkunde von 1408 eine Stelle an, wonach ein Aussätziger mit der Hand eines totgeborenen (also sündenfreien) Kindes, in die etwas Salbe gethan, bestrichen und geheilt wird. Noch jetzt ist im österreichischen Volksglauben, dass durch Auflegen einer toten Hand bösesartiges Geschwür heile" (p. 52). Menstrual blood also heals leprosy (p. 29).

¹ See Matthew 26 : 6. PREUSS, op. cit., p. 388. If Jesus can enter Simon's house: "so folgt schon daraus, dass der Evangelist unter Lepra nicht den Aussatz verstanden hat." KLOSTERMANN, Das Markusevangelium, asks with reference to Mk. 14 : 3: "ὁ Λεπρός ein Schimpfname? oder war Simon etwa ein ehemaliger Aussätziger?" KEULERS, Mattheüs: "He was called the leper because he had formerly been leprous: perhaps he had been healed by Jesus." BERKELBACH VAN DER SPENKEL, Markus, also thinks that we are "obviously" concerned here with a healed man. The origin of Simon's nickname will, however, remain obscure . . . LINDEBOOM, Geschiedenis der geneeskunde, p. 35, considers it improbable that Lazarus (Lk. 16 : 20) suffered from leprosy ("mal de Ladre"). According to Lindeboom it is perhaps advisable to translate zara'ath by for instance scabbiness. See also SIMONS, op. cit., p. 175. PREUSS, op. cit., p. 406, says that it was definitely not leprosy: "denn einen Leptösen hätte der Reiche sicherlich nicht an seiner Tür geduldet. Dass der Ausdruck Lazarushäuser und Lazarette ursprünglich nur für Leprosorien gebraucht wurde, spricht natürlich nicht dagegen." STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 223, "εἰλωμένος etwa = מִכָּה שָׁחִי 'mit Geschwüren behaftet'."

² PREUSS, op. cit., devotes a separate section to "Die Krankheit Hiobs," pp. 390-394. Various diseases have been envisaged: syphilis, Syrian throat plague, black smallpox. "Alle grossen Wandlungen in ärztlichen Erfahrungen und Meinungen spiegeln sich auch in den Auslegungen der biblischen Kranken-

We have now come to the account in which it is stated how Jesus healed a leper.¹

1. *Composition of the account.* As is often the case, we are in the dark here about the time and place of action. Matthew places the incident after the Sermon on the Mount. Possibly his arrangement must be regarded as practical rather than chronological and the link between verses 1 and 2 is of a purely literary nature. Matthew gives no information on the place of action.² Mark does not help us, either. SCHMIDT wonders whether the new pericope could possibly be

geschichten wider," comments Preuss ironically. The fact that leprosy is mostly envisaged is because the word "leprosy:" "das grosse Sammelbecken war, in das man alle Hautleiden warf." Preuss himself thinks that Job was tormented by a serious, itching skin disease. "Man wird also kaum fehlgehen, wenn man in der Krankheit Hiobs ein universelles Ekzem sieht" (p. 391). HÖLSCHER, *Das Buch Hiob*, comments on Job 2 : 7-10: "er (der Erzähler) meint wohl, wie auch die späteren Andeutungen der Dichtung nahelegen (cf. zu c. 6-7), den knolligen Aussatz (Lepros tuberculosa), der nach Lv 13₁₈ mit Geschwüren anfängt und für den gerade das quälende Jucken der Haut charakteristisch ist." Hölscher says this in the "zweite, verbesserte Auflage" published in 1952; exactly the same may be found in the first edition, dating from 1937. HEHN, RGG, IV, col. 1843, claims that Job suffered from the: "schlimmste Art des Aussatzes." In his meaningful discussion of the book of Job: "Antwoord uit het Onweder," MISKOTTE speaks of "a horrifying leprosy," which covered Job with evil sores, p. 89. . . . BARTH, K.D., IV, 3, p. 461, thinks it best to refrain from making a diagnosis. "Mir will es nicht einleuchten, dass die Anlage, der Geist und Stil dieser Gedichte es erlauben soll, sie so pragmatisch zu lesen, ihnen solche Konkretionen zu entnehmen, was man ja auch bei der Auslegung der entsprechenden Stellen in den Psalmen besser unterlassen wird." WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 378, points to an article by Dr. G. G. Robertson in the *Lancet* of 10 July, 1947. "He quotes the story of Job, who developed a skin disease after the shock of the loss of his worldly wealth, when he was puzzled because God had apparently deserted him. Dr. Robertson goes on to give cases in his own practice in which a sense of injustice at any rate coincided with, and perhaps caused, intractable skin disease." It seems desirable to us that commentators should mention, however briefly, medical opinions regarding symptoms stated in the Bible. For one is still free not to share the doctors' opinions.

¹ Mt. 8 : 1-4; Mk. 1 : 40-45; Lk. 5 : 12-16. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, classifies the account among the "Novellen;" BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, puts it among the "Wundergeschichten." PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 32, distinguishes between two parts in Mt. 8 : 2-4: 1) Bitte-Heilungswort: 2) Heilung-Verbreitungsgebot.

² KEULERS, *Matthäus*. "Matthew establishes a more practical connection; by placing the story of the leper immediately after the Sermon on the Mount, he endeavoured to demonstrate that Jesus really respected the law of Moses (cf. 5, 17 with 8, 4)." KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäus-evangelium*, believes that chapters 8 : 1-9:34 may be regarded: "als eine grosse Illustration der Wundermacht Jesu." Matthew gives pride of place to the healing of the leper, so that what Jesus said in 5 : 17 is spotlighted.

made to begin with 1 : 39. It could, but this does not help us. It might then be supposed that the healing took place in some synagogue or the other. But this remains a supposition.¹ Luke places the story before the Sermon on the Mount. He has the healing take place "in a certain city," 5 : 12.

The account itself is given in much the same words in the three versions. At a given moment Jesus is approached by a leper who "worshipped" Him, Mt. 8 : 2 — "kneeling down," Mk. 1 : 40, whilst Luke 5 : 12 has : "fell on his face" — and who begged Him: "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," Mt. 8 : 2 and Lk. 5 : 12; "If thou wilt, thou canst make me clean," Mk. 1 : 40. Matthew and Luke describe Jesus' action briefly and in straightforward fashion: Jesus "put forth his hand, and touched him, saying, I will; be thou clean," Mt. 8 : 3, Lk. 5 : 13. Mark adds: "moved with compassion," 1 : 41.²

The effect of Jesus' touch and His words spoken with power is related in matter-of-fact terms. "And immediately his leprosy was cleansed," Mt. 8 : 3. "Immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed," Mk. 1 : 42. "And immediately the leprosy departed from him," Lk. 5 : 13. The command that Jesus gave the leper consisted of a prohibition and an order. The prohibition was: "See thou tell no man," Mt. 8 : 4, whilst the order was that the healed man had to comply with the obligations prescribed by law. We are

¹ SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*. Schmidt points to the differences among the Synoptists and says: "Was fehlt ist eine chronologische und topographische Fixierung dieser Erzählung" (p. 63 f.). An encounter in the synagogue was possible, since lepers were allowed to attend services in the synagogues: see above. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, rejects the idea of a synagogue as the scene of action.

² *σπλαγχνισθεῖς*. Some mss. have *ὀργισθεῖς*, filled with wrath. DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, says: "Mk. 1, 41 hat Cod D sinnloser Weise *ὀργισθεῖς* für *σπλαγχνισθεῖς* des gewöhnlichen Textes" (p. 51). STÄHLIN, *TWNT*, V, p. 428, note 326, is of the opinion that the version *ὀργισθεῖς* is to be preferred to: "der üblichen, leichter erklärbaren *σπλαγχνισθεῖς*." VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*, thinks that *ὀργισθεῖς* may be original. The reason for Jesus' wrath would have been that the leper mingled with other people against the law . . . MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 46, likewise considers *ὀργισθεῖς* original. "Such a word might well be changed from motives of reverence." Other explanations are: the leper hindered Jesus' work as preacher; Jesus was wrathful because the man said dubiously: "if thou wilt;" the subject of the wrath was not Jesus, but the leper. See EITREM, *Demonology*, p. 42 f. Eitrem's conclusion is: "After all it seems preferable to interpret this cure of the leper as *originally* effected by the expulsion of a demon. Actually Talmudic demon-lore knew a spirit of leprosy (Horayoth 10a; L. Blau, 1. 1., p. 13 f.)."

struck by the fact that Mark again has an addition: "And he straitly charged him, and forthwith sent him away," 1 : 43. In Matthew the account ends with Jesus' instructions; Luke tells that Jesus' fame spread further and further and ever greater multitudes gathered to hear Jesus and to be healed by Him, whilst Mark states that the man "began to publish it much, and to blaze abroad the matter," so that Jesus could no longer openly enter the city, "but was without in desert places," 1 : 45. None of the Synoptists states that the leper went and showed himself to the priest.

2. *Exegetic comments.* Under what circumstances did the encounter between Jesus and the leper take place? According to Matthew it may be supposed that this happened when a large multitude had gathered around Jesus, but if we regard the link between Mt. 8 : 1 and verse 2 as a literary one — which it very probably is — nothing can be said about the size of the company with Jesus. Mark does not offer a single starting point. Luke places the event "in a certain city." Is this a reference to Lk. 4 : 43, where Jesus says that He must preach the Kingdom of God "to other cities also?" Or must we regard the designation as an aspect of the frequent use that Luke makes of the word "city?" We must not think of a "walled" town, since entry into these was forbidden to lepers, but of a large village.¹ Luke says that the man was "full of leprosy," i.e. entirely "covered" with leprosy.² This characterization need not point to an extra-serious case, nor need it imply medical terminology.³ "Full" is a commonplace expression which is still often used in the case of

¹ STRATHMANN, TWNT, VI, p. 528 ff. The word polis nowhere means "state" in the New Testament. It occurs 160 times, most frequently in the works of Luke (80 times). "Der Gebrauch von πόλις ist demnach im Neuen Testament ganz und gar unpolitisch. πόλις bedeutet einfach die geschlossene menschliche Siedlung, im Gegensatz zu unbewohnten Gegenden, Fluren, Dörfern und einzelnen Häusern . . . Der Unterschied von πόλις und κώμη ist nicht immer scharf." See Mk. 1 : 38; κωμοπόλεις, "countrified" towns. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 4: "Mit κωμοπόλεις sind grössere stadtähnliche Dörfer gemeint. Josephus, Bell. J. 3, 3, 2 . . . versichert, dass die kleinste Ortschaft Galiläas zu seiner Zeit wohl über 15.000 Einwohner gezählt habe." SCHÜRER, Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes, II, p. 179 ff. GALLING, Bibl. Reallexikon, col. 496: "Wenn im NT und bei Josephus zwischen Dorf (κώμη) und Stadt (πόλις) unterschieden wird, so ist damit wesentlich die *Rechtssituation* gegenüber Rom bzw. der landsässigen Obrigkeit gemeint (Schürer II, p. 73 ff., 179 ff.)."

² See DELLING, TWNT, VI, p. 283 ff., πλήρης.

³ KLOSTERMANN, Das Lukasevangelium, poses the question: "Steigerung, medizinischer Ausdruck (Hobart) oder rhythmisch besser (Loisy)?" Cf. VAN VELDHIJZEN, Lukas de medicijnmeester, p. 108.

serious external symptoms of some disease or the other, e.g. full of sores, full of lumps, etc.

A difficult question is what the man had in mind when he asked Jesus: "Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean." Though the form of address "Lord" occurs in Luke, we do not find it in Mark, and it need not have any Christological significance here. The words "if thou wilt" with which the sick man introduces his request express no doubt in Jesus' power, as KEULERS rightly remarks. But we cannot share KEULERS' view that the man doubted Jesus' willingness to heal him, since he was not worthy of healing.¹

"If thou wilt" may be taken in the somewhat weak meaning of: if you are prepared or inclined, if it pleases you, or in the stronger meaning of: if you can make up your mind to do so. In our opinion the latter meaning is preferable: the words contain something of an appeal to someone's power.²

The request as such confronts us with greater difficulties. For what reason did the leper believe that Jesus could "make him clean?" Did he perhaps regard Jesus as an expert in the field of leprosy, so that a favourable certificate from Jesus might have persuaded a priest to issue a certificate of cleanness? However, it is difficult to reconcile this view with the idea that the man was doubtless acquainted with Jesus' healings in general. Did the sick man regard Jesus as some wandering miracle-working rabbi?³ Or did the man consider Jesus to be endowed with divine power, as PLUMMER suggests?⁴ In the light of the Gospels' witness of Christ this last view

¹ KEULERS, Mattheüs. Cf. PLUMMER, St. Luke. "He doubts the will to heal."

² KLOSTERMANN, Das Markusevangelium, points to Epict., III, 10, 14 f.: "Why do you fawn upon the doctor? Why do you say: if you will, master, I shall be happy? . . ." "Ein Zweifel, ob Jesus die Krankheit wird heilen *wollen*, liegt nicht in den Worten." BULTMANN, Ergänzungsheft (Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition), p. 13: "Mk. 1, 40 f. erscheint in den Fragments of an unknown Gospel by H. Idris Bell and T. C. Skeat in der Form: 'Und siehe ein Aussätziger kommt zu ihm und sagt: "Lehrer Jesu, als ich mit Aussätzigen zusammen wanderte und mit ihnen in der Herberge zusammen ass, bin ich auch selber aussätzig geworden. Wenn du nun willst, werde ich rein!"' (Goro Mayeda, Das Leben-Jesu-Fragment Pap. Egerton 2, 1946, S. 8 u. 32)."

³ See the chapter: Magical and Miraculous Practices of the Jews in Jesus' Day.

⁴ PLUMMER, St. Luke. "The *δύναμις* is evidence of strong faith in the Divine power of Jesus; for leprosy was believed to be incurable by human means." BERKELBACH VAN DER SPENKEL, Markus, says that this cry comes from someone who has "the gaze of the believer" which "sees the open door of the Kingdom of God." Theological exegesis has its doubtful sides, too! For the time being all this man wants is healing: nothing is said about an "open door."

is the most attractive, but it is not impossible that the man himself had other ideas. In any case, he was convinced that Jesus could "make him clean."

The rationalistic explanation is that the words "make clean" here must be interpreted in the sense of "pronounce clean." PAULUS says that the leper asked Jesus for a certificate of cleanness. For he was "full of leprosy," which indicated that the healing was already in progress.¹ Of the objections made to this interpretation we shall first mention that of Paulus' great opponent, STRAUSS. STRAUSS has said with justice that Luke's statement that the sick man was "full of leprosy" can be more easily interpreted to mean that he was displaying the highest degree of leprosy than that he was already on the way to recovery!² In the second place it must be assumed that the man knew — it may be presumed that he had already shown himself to a priest once or several times — that only the pronouncement of a priest could release him from his misery. A request addressed to Jesus in this spirit would therefore have been pointless. It is thus clear that "make clean" here has the meaning of heal.³

The treatment which Jesus applied consisted of a gesture and a few words. "And Jesus put forth his hand, and touched him, saying,

¹ PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 703 ff. Jesus touched him: "denn man sah, dass er die eigentliche lepra = die sich schon ganz abschälende Schädlichkeit hatte." The man asks for: "reinmachen, theils durch Heilung, theils durch Erklärung über die Art meiner Krankheit als nicht ansteckend."

² STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 54 ff. . . . Strauss says that Paulus' view that the ordinary, the natural, must be assumed in all cases where the opposite is not expressly indicated is not correct.

³ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*. In Mk. 1 : 40 and 42 Mark means: "sicher als Reinmachen mittelst eines Wunders; die Reinerklärung schiebt Jesus auch nach V. 44 der Behörde zu." PLUMMER, *St. Luke*: "The old rationalistic explanation, that καθαρίσαι means 'to pronounce clean,' and that the man was already cured, but wanted the great Rabbi of Nazareth to absolve him from the expensive and troublesome journey to Jerusalem, contradicts the plain statements of the Gospels . . . If καθαρίσαι means 'to pronounce clean,' then καθαρίσθητι means 'be thou pronounced clean.' Yet Jesus sends him to the priest (Lk. Mk. Mt.)." DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*, Jesus did not take the place of the priest. HAUCK, *Markus*, is opposed to the above-mentioned idea of "Reinsprechung," which is also to be found in J. Weiss. GOPPELT, *Typos*, p. 81, has the same objection to J. Weiss. EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*, p. 90 f., rejects as unsatisfactory Friedreich's opinion that Jesus observed that the leprosy was in the last stage, so that He pronounced him clean and healed. "Man könnte sich höchstens vorstellen, dass Christus in den seine Hilfe erfordernden Fällen die Überzeugung gewonnen habe, dass die Priester, welche ihre massgebende Meinung abgeben sollten, die Harmlosigkeit der betreffenden Ausschlagformen bestätigen würden."

I will; be thou clean," Mt. 8 : 3 and parallel passages. Putting forth His hand must not be interpreted as a defensive gesture, whilst touching did not serve to institute an investigation of the state of the disease by palpating the patient, as PAULUS thinks: Jesus' gesture must be regarded in the light of the whole of His methods of treatment.¹

The fact that a non-leper touched a leper doubtless moved the sick man deeply and strengthened him in his conviction that his request to Jesus had not been in vain.²

Moreover, by this touch Jesus made it clear to all that He did not hesitate to break through the whole cultic and ritual system, which at the same time hygienically surrounded leprosy like a sanitary cordon!³ Jesus' gesture and His words mean the same thing: "I will, be thou clean." SCHRENK remarks that in this "will" Jesus decides and acts like the divinely sent Plenipotentiary.⁴ Jesus' words have nothing in common with a priestly pronouncement, in which a straightforward "clean" or "unclean" is expressed; He said with emphasis that the cleansing, i.e. the healing, would follow immediately and completely! The Synoptists are unanimous in their account: "immediately" the man was cleansed of his leprosy; according to Mark and Luke the disease "departed from" him. The text cannot be misunderstood; what is meant is a sudden, complete healing that can be seen by everyone.⁵

¹ See the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment.

² GREYDANUS, Lukas. "This touch also helped him to realize that he was in fact being cleansed by the Lord."

³ PLUMMER, St. Luke. "Jesus touched the leper on the same principle as that on which He healed on the Sabbath: the ceremonial law gives place to the law of charity when the two come into collision. His touch aided the leper's faith." Cf. the article by HAUCK, TWNT, III, p. 427 ff.: Rein und Unrein im Neuen Testament. "Der Gedanke der dinglichen Verunreinigung fällt. Die sittlich-religiöse Reinheit tritt an die Stelle der kultisch-rituellen."

⁴ SCHRENK, TWNT, III, p. 47 f. Das θέλειν Jesu. Through Jesus' reply to the leper's request: "erhält die Handlung Gewicht als Ausführung befreiender Gewalt." BORNHÄUSER, Das Wirken des Christus, p. 69 f.: "Jesus *kann* alle Kranken heilen, aber er *muss* es nicht. Er heilt, welche er will (!). Er hat nicht nur Generalvollmacht zu heilen, er hat auch Generalvollmacht zu entscheiden, wann er heilen will und wann nicht." See Mt. 11 : 27; Jn. 5 : 21. KAFKA, Naturgesetz, Freiheit u. Wunder, p. 104 f., speaks here of a "gewirktes Wunder;" it emanates from the person. The concept "command" or "order" is of great importance to the "gewirktes Wunder." Kafka envisages a second category of miracles, the "geschehende Wunder," as occur for instance at places of pilgrimage.

⁵ PLUMMER, St. Luke. "All three have εὐθέως or εὐθύς, showing that Jesus not merely prepared the way for a cure which nature accomplished, but healed the leper at once by His touch."

The Synoptists each conclude their accounts in an individual way. The shortest version is Matthew's: "And Jesus saith unto him, See thou tell no man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them."¹ Luke has much the same wording, but adds that the fame of Jesus spread further and further and great multitudes gathered to hear Him and to be healed by Him. Mark's version differs from these on two points. Firstly he states that Jesus "straitly charged him, and forthwith sent him away." Secondly he says that the man "began to publish it much, and to blaze abroad the matter," so that Jesus could no longer openly enter the "city."

Let us start with Mark's divergent version. For what reason did Jesus send the man away at once, after "straitly charging him?" This translation is, come to that, a fairly mild one, for the terminology that Mark uses is more reminiscent of the banishing of a demon than of sending away a man who has just been healed: He "inveighed" against the man and "drove" him away!² Mark's version is not clear and has caused commentators a great deal of perplexity. Is the harsh command motivated by: go at once to the priest without first speaking to others? Did Jesus wish to prevent the priests hearing about the case before the arrival of the man himself, so that they might withhold from him the declaration of cleanness out of hostility to Jesus? Or does the harsh tone relate in particular to the injunction to silence? Had the man to be protected against overweening pride and the people against overexcitement? Or is the explanation that Jesus wanted to have the Jewish regulations observed unconditionally, so that He could not be reproached with disregarding the ordinances? It is difficult to find a satisfactory solution; however, it is not impossible that in an original tradition the idea of the banishing of a demon was present, which makes the strange choice of words more understandable. It is not stated whether the man immediately obeyed Jesus' order. It is true that Mark says that he repeatedly infringed against the injunction to silence, which made it impossible for Jesus, who in the eyes of the law had become unclean through the contact with the leper and was hampered by the gathering of ever greater multitudes, openly to enter the village. But even in the lonely places

¹ Mt. 8 : 4; Mk. 1 : 44; Lk. 5 : 14.

² ἐμβριμάομαι = snort, roar, abuse, inveigh against someone... ἐξέβαλε: he drove him out. The verb ἐκβάλλω can, however, also be interpreted in a milder sense: he let him go. See HAUCK, TWNT, I, p. 524 ff.

where Jesus stayed after that, they came to Him from all sides.

The command to the healed man to show himself to the priest and to make the sacrifice prescribed by Moses for the healing occurs in the Synoptists in practically the same wording. The man had first to show himself to the priest in his place of residence and had then to go to Jerusalem to be pronounced "clean" there, after which the sacrifice had to be made in accordance with the provisions of Lev. 14.¹ However, Jesus added a few words to these instructions which have given rise to a considerable difference of opinion among exegetes. What did Jesus mean by "a testimony unto them?" Does "them" refer to the people or to the priests? Did Jesus mean a testimony "for them" or "against them?" Various views and combinations of views are possible. If "them" relates to the people, the addition may mean that by the sacrifice made by the man the healing will be vouched for to the people, and he can therefore be admitted again into the community. This is the way in which KLOSTERMANN, for instance, interprets it.² It can also be taken to mean that the man, by observing the law, as it were demonstrates to the people that Jesus does not disregard the law.

When "them" is related to the priests, different opinions are again possible. The most obvious interpretation, one adduced by many, is that Jesus wanted to make the priests clearly see that He had not come to break the laws and regulations. This view is defended by ALLEN, DEHN and KEULERS.³

Others believe that the healing of the leper had to serve for the

¹ See SCHRENK, TWNT, III, p. 264, note 28: "Der Priester ist nicht in Jerusalem zu denken. Nach TNeg 8, 2 . . . hat sich der genesene Aussätzige zunächst an seinem Ort dem Priester zu zeigen, ehe er in Jerusalem für rein erklärt wird."

² KLOSTERMANN, Das Markusevangelium. "εἰς μάρτυριον αὐτοῖς: nicht = stelle dich den Priestern, damit sie meine Macht oder meine Loyalität gegenüber dem Gesetz erkennen, sondern: opfere was Mose vorgeschrieben hat, damit die Genesung den Leuten verbürgt sei."

³ ALLEN, St. Matthew. "The clause can only refer to the supposed hostility of Jesus to the law already implied in 5, 17-20 . . . The illustration here given of Christ's attitude towards legal ceremonies may be one reason why the editor places this incident immediately after the Sermon on the Mount." DEHN, Der Gottessohn. "Zum Zeugnis über (= für) sie" means that the healing confirmed by the priest is publicly "bezeugt." "Also dies ist der Sinn: Der Sohn Gottes stellt sich willig und gehorsam unter das Gesetz, dessen Bestimmungen er einfach als gegebene Ordnungen anerkennt." KEULERS, Mattheüs: It is not a matter of a health certificate from the priest which the healed man could show; the certificate relates to compliance with the law: "the priests must recognize by this that the Messiah remains faithful to the law."

priests as a testimony, i.e. as a proof and guarantee, that He, Jesus, who had healed the man, was truly the Messiah, whose work it also was to heal lepers.¹ VAN LEEUWEN tries to link up both views, viz. Jesus' obedience of the law and His power as Messiah.²

All these explanations have one thing in common, viz. they are of a positive nature and express positive values. Whoever "them" may be, and one can then take it at will to mean people or priests, the cleansing sacrifice of the leper serves for "them" as a "witness" to something positive, viz. as a guarantee of the healing or as a sign of Jesus' obedience of the law and of His power, depending again on how this is interpreted. In any case Jesus' words "a testimony unto them" do not in these explanations have the sombre tone that they acquire when "unto them" is read as "against them," a version which is quite plausible and which was defended at quite an early stage.³

NOW STRATHMANN has introduced a new element into the matter which may bring us much nearer to the solution. According to this scholar, an investigation into the concept "testimony" has clearly revealed that the word "testimony" here, as in many other places, has the meaning of incriminating testimony, evidence for the prosecution. Now, if the priest should presently establish that healing has taken place, this will form for the "people" — according to STRATHMANN Jesus has the people in mind — highly incriminating

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 474 f., refers with respect to the words εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς to Jubilees 1 : 7 f.; 4 : 19; 10 : 17; Apoc. of Baruch 84 : 7, in which texts "testimony" is approximately synonymous with "proof." Strack-Billerbeck then says: "So soll der geheilte Aussätzige den Priestern in Jerusalem zum Zeugnis dienen, dass der erschienen ist, der die Aussätzigen rein macht." CALVIN, Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas, says that the leper had to go to the priest to thank God (Ergo Christus leprosum ad Sacerdotem ablegans, sibi non aliud propositum fuisse testatur nisi ut Dei gloriam illustraret). The "a testimony unto them" definitely refers to the priests, says Calvin.

² VAN LEEUWEN, Markus. It serves as a testimony for the priests.

³ Mk. 6 : 11, for instance, has: εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς, where Lk. 9 : 5 has: εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς. Both texts are concerned with the same thing: the action consisting in shaking dust off the feet is a symbol and concrete proof in one: it serves as "a testimony against them." In Mk. 13 : 9 the persecution and what is involved in it are regarded as proof "against them," εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς. Mt. 10 : 18 need not be in conflict with this point of view . . . TRENCH, Notes on the Miracles, p. 220, remarks with reference to Mt. 8 : 4 and parallel passages: "But I cannot doubt that the true meaning of the words is, 'for a testimony against them'; for a witness against their unbelief, who are refusing to give credence to me, even while I am attesting myself to be all which I claim to be, by such mighty works as these; works of which they themselves shall have ratified the reality by the acceptance of thy gift, by thy re-admission, as one truly cleansed, into the congregation of the people' (John V. 36; XV. 24)."

evidence against the unbelief in which they persist. It will militate against them and accuse them, just as the many works performed by Jesus in the towns of Chorazin and Bethsaida will on the day of Judgment testify against the inhabitants of those towns.¹ If we take Jesus' words "a testimony unto them" to mean "incriminating evidence against them," in which "them" does not mean the people but the priests, we have an entirely acceptable explanation. Jesus then meant the following: it will be damning evidence against the priests if they establish that a healing has taken place and accept the cleansing sacrifice but do not recognize the person and the power of the healer. They will be condemned by the evidence supplied by themselves; they will themselves have provided the material that incriminates them!²

¹ STRATHMANN, TWNT, IV, p. 477 ff. On p. 488 f. Strathmann discusses the use of μαρτύριον. Marturion may have the meaning of objective testimony, a piece of proof that can be recalled and that can become an accusation. See for instance Gen. 21 : 30 (seven ewe lambs as witness); Gen. 31 : 44, 45 (a stone as witness to a covenant between Jacob and Laban); Joshua 24 : 25-27 (the stone at Shechem, which may also become a "witness unto you, lest ye deny your God"); Deu. 31 : 19, 26 (a song and a book of the law as witnesses). On p. 508 ff. STRATHMANN speaks of the use of μαρτύριον in the New Testament. "Hinsichtlich des Gebrauchs und der Bedeutung ist davon auszugehen, dass μαρτύριον im Gegensatz zu μαρτυρία nicht den Vorgang der Zeugnisabgabe meint und dass auch bei dem Zeugnis streng genommen weniger an den Inhalt als daran zu denken ist, dass das objektiv vorliegende Zeugnis, mag es sich dabei um einen Gegenstand, einen Vorgang oder auch eine Äusserung handeln, als Beweismittel Verwendung findet. Dies tritt im NT überall dort hervor, wo sich die Wendung εἰς μαρτύριον mit dem Dativ der Person findet, für welche das Zeugnis von Bedeutung ist, und zwar von belastender Bedeutung." STRATHMANN points to Old Testament references such as Gen. 31 : 44; Deu. 31 : 26; Jos. 24 : 27 and to New Testament ones such as Jas. 5 : 3; Mk. 6 : 11; Lk. 9 : 5. "Auch die Weisung Jesu an den geheilten Aussätzigen, sich dem Priester zu zeigen und die vorgeschriebenen Opfer darzubringen 'εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς' Mk 1, 44 par wird so zu deuten sein. Wird vom Priester die tatsächlich geschehene Heilung festgestellt, so bedeutet das ein schweres Belastungszeugnis für den Unglauben, in welchem das Volk (αὐτοῖς!) dennoch beharrt. Die Stelle ist nach Mt 11, 20-24 auszulegen." In note 75 (p. 509) STRATHMANN says: "Mt 5, 17 zur Dtg von Mk 1, 44 heranzuziehen, ist willkürlich."

² Cf. C. H. TURNER, The Gospel according to St. Mark (in A New Commentary on Holy Scripture). "The cure of the leper would be a sign to the priests that a new and beneficent power was present in their midst, and if they either neglected the sign, or wilfully referred a good work to an evil origin, would be a 'testimony against them'." Cf. SCHRENK, TWNT, III, p. 264. Jesus quietly accepts the regulations in this matter. "Aber der Hauptzweck ist nicht Stützung priesterlicher Autorität. Das εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς weist vielmehr hin auf die Bedeutung, welche die Heilung Jesu für den Priester hat. Sie ist sprechendes Zeugnis für Jesu Vollmacht. Der Priester selbst hat durch seine Feststellung zu dieser Bezeugung mitzuwirken."

Like so many others who had received healing from Jesus, this man did not observe the injunction to silence either.¹ By this he hampered the public ministry of his benefactor. "The city," Mk. 1 : 45, probably means Capernaum and not a town in general. Jesus' stay in lonely places could not, however, stop people coming to Him from all sides.

3. *Explanations, summaries and conclusions.* So far we have been concerned with an investigation of the details, but now the question comes to the fore of how the account as a whole must be interpreted and what idea we can form of this case of disease.

We have already mentioned PAULUS' rationalistic explanation in the previous section. According to him, the state of the disease was such that the man was not infectious, whilst the disease took a turn for the better as a result of the contact which the sick man had had with Jesus.² STRAUSS has serious objections to this view. In his opinion a fabulous event is related, which cannot be explained in natural terms. If, says STRAUSS, this story is compared with Ex. 4 : 6, 7, Nu. 12 : 10 ff. and 2 Ki. 5, it cannot but be agreed that the "anecdote" told in the Gospels originates in these accounts.³

Whilst FENNER, who can hardly fit the healing of lepers into his hysteria hypothesis, tends towards Strauss' view, GOPPELT, who is responsible for a searching typological interpretation of the Old Testament in the New Testament, comes to quite a different conclusion. He is of the opinion that no parallels in the Old Testament can be found for a whole series of Jesus' miracles — in the Old Testament the banishing of demons and the healing of the deaf, blind, paralysed, etc., are nowhere ascribed to the prophets — nor can he find any reference in the New Testament accounts of the healing of lepers to the two Old Testament parallels, Nu. 12 : 10 ff. and 2 Ki. 5 : 1 ff.⁴ There is thus no shortage of controversies!

¹ As regards the injunction to silence, see the chapter: The Healing of the Possessed.

² PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 706, takes the word εὐθὺς, immediately, in the sense of εὖ-θελεῖν, i.e. to go well: "weil es auf dem geraden Wege gut und leicht geht." The leprosy would therefore gradually disappear . . . Paulus ascribes the frequent occurrence of skin disease in Palestine to the poverty and the way of life. "Der entsetzliche Druck, unter welchem zu Jesu Zeit das Volk durch Römer und Hierarchen lebte, musste damals eine Menge solcher und anderer verzweiflungsvoller Körperübel zur Folge haben" (p. 702).

³ STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 58 f. FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 67 f.

⁴ GOPPELT, *Typos*, p. 81 . . . Goppelt thinks that the fact that there is no

If the rationalistic explanation of Paulus and others and the mythical interpretation of Strauss and those of like mind are rejected, this does not mean that room is left for only one interpretation of the text. This already becomes evident when dealing with the first problem that arises, viz. that of leprosy. Did the man suffer from leprosy in the modern sense of the word?

We have already pointed to the doubt and denial prevalent in this respect in medical circles. EBSTEIN, who is of the opinion that Biblical leprosy is used as a collective title for every form of skin complaint, states that medicine has no record of improvements in leprosy that are instantly visible. However, that does not mean to say, EBSTEIN continues, that a gradual spontaneous cure is out of the question.¹

From the theological side, too, there is doubt whether this is really leprosy. FENNER says that the account cannot be regarded as historical, not even if a mild form of leprosy is presumed. Moreover, there is no question of leprosy in the modern sense of the word.² MICHAELIS is cautious, and speaks of "dubious," whilst MICKLEM remarks that, whilst it is possible that the same disease is meant, he considers it more probable that the man suffered from a milder form of skin disease.³ Continuing on the trail of the supposed mild

"Hinweis" here to Nu. 12 : 10 ff. and 2 Ki. 5 : 1 ff. at the same time forms a refutation of the idea that in Mk. 1 : 40-45 there was originally a reference to "kultische Reinsprechung," "aus der erst allmählich unter dem Einfluss der atl Stellen die Wunderheilung geworden ist," as J. Weiss sees it.

¹ EBSTEIN, op. cit., p. 90 f.

² FENNER, op. cit., p. 68: "Ihre Gleichsetzung mit der heute als Lepra bezeichneten Krankheit ist ebensowenig angängig, wie die der ntl paralysis mit der heutigen Paralyse."

³ MICHAELIS, TWNT, IV, p. 240: "Ob freilich im AT und NT die Krankheit gemeint ist, die wir heute als Lepra bezeichnen, muss fraglich sein." Michaelis lists a number of authorities who do not believe the two to be identical, including G. N. Münch, Ebstein, R. Otto, Fenner . . . MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 45: "It may possibly bear this meaning; but it is as likely, indeed more likely, to refer to some milder skin disease." TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 84, speaks of "a distressing skin disease, not to be confused with modern leprosy." WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 55: "The view is now generally accepted that in the New Testament the word 'leprosy' was used to cover a variety of skin diseases, like psoriasis and eczema, marked by white, scaly scabs on the skin; and that it was not regarded as a terrible disease in itself nor as highly contagious, but was dreaded because it made its victims ceremonially unclean." One should note Jesus' instructions to the disciples, Mt. 10 : 8, "to 'heal' the sick, but to 'cleanse' the lepers." As regards the healing, Weatherhead draws attention to "the relationship between the emotional condition of the deep mind and skin disease."

form, MICKLEM points out that certain skin diseases occur which are susceptible to mental influence.¹ SENG and LIEK, both doctors, also draw attention to the effect which mental forces can have on both the healthy and the sick skin.² It would certainly be interesting to collect startling cases of improvements brought about by hypnosis and suggestion in skin complaints, and psychosomatic treatment might yield striking results in some cases, but we shall have to forgo all these possibilities and methods of treatment simply because every attempt at an explanation made in this direction breaks down on the unanimous Synoptic testimony that we are not concerned here with a gradual cure or a turn for the better, but with an instantaneous, radical healing. "And. . . immediately the leprosy departed from him, and he was cleansed!"

PLUMMER deduces from the note added by Luke to the effect that the man was "full of leprosy" that everyone could see from the symptoms on his face and hands that the disease was in an advanced stage. He thinks it probable that this was a case as described in Lev. 13 : 12, 13: "And if a leprosy break out abroad in the skin, and the leprosy cover all the skin of him that hath the plague from his head even to his foot, wheresoever the priest looketh; Then the priest

¹ MICKLEM, *op. cit.*, p. 48 f., with reference to examples given by Bonjour, Guérisons, and Baudouin, *Suggestion and Autosuggestion*. Mild hypnosis and suggestion are said to have had a salutary effect in cases of severe eczema.

² SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 18: "Dass Hautveränderungen unter dem Einfluss psychischer Wirkungen stehen können, wissen wir zunächst von den Stigmatisierten, dann aber auch aus der Praxis." LIEK, *Het wonder in de geneeskunde*, p. 180 ff., draws attention to an article: "Psychische invloeden bij de behandeling der Lepra," in the *Geneeskundig Tijdschrift voor Nederlandsch-Indië*, 1925, Vol. 65, No. 6. This includes the following: a promising new medicine against leprosy has been found. The leper colonies are wildly excited. All want to be treated, and successes are visible. But the treatment is painful and relapses occur. The leprosy bacilli do not disappear. Conclusion: it was not the medicine but suggestion that brought about the improvements. Liek says that various leprosy research-workers have told him that "the often extreme improvements in leprosy patients are for the greater part not brought about by the medicine itself, but by the suggestion by which the treatment is more or less accompanied." WEATHERHEAD, *op. cit.*, p. 376 ff., devotes a section to "Skin Diseases." He says: "A skin disease appears to the layman as an obvious example of an organic disease having a purely physical origin. The ordinary layman has no idea of the work already done in estimating the effect on the skin of emotional and nervous states." Weatherhead describes various cases of nervous skin troubles and their healing in a short space of time. He says that all this has "an interesting relevance" to the healing of "so-called 'leprosy' in the gospels" (p. 379).

shall consider: and, behold, if the leprosy have covered all his flesh, he shall pronounce him clean that hath the plague: it is all turned white: he is clean." According to PLUMMER, this is why the man had dared to join the multitude and why others did not avoid him.¹ Suppositions such as this one can of course always be made, but they do not satisfy us.

Finally, it must be asked what the reason could have been for this healing being preserved in the Evangelical tradition. Do the wording and the position of the account suggest that the author was guided by a certain intention? Elsewhere we have pointed to the opinion of some exegetes that the place where the account appears in Matthew evidences a certain intention of this Evangelist, viz. the specifying of Jesus' positive attitude towards the law.

SCHNIEWIND — who is of the opinion that the miracles must not be regarded as "proofs" of Jesus' power but as signs which have to make clear the content and the significance of His ministry — holds the view that in the account of the healing of the leper Jesus' struggle concerning the law is spotlighted.² The sole support that could be found for this opinion would be the place which the account has in Matthew's version. In both Mark and Luke it occurs in a cycle of miracle stories in which SCHNIEWIND's theory does not find a single foothold. Moreover, there is a dubious element in the perpetration of exegesis as SCHNIEWIND does here, where he gives the impression of knowing the "system!"

If we read the account properly, the healing did not take place to spotlight the law, but the regulations of the law had to be observed to spotlight the healing! In other words, the healing of the leper

¹ PLUMMER, St. Luke.

² SCHNIEWIND, *Das NTD*, I, 1, p. 104 f., re Mt. 8 : 1-4: "Es wäre an sich denkbar, dass unsere Evangelisten durch die Wundererzählungen Jesu Macht 'beweisen' wollten: so sind diese Erzählungen oft seit den Tagen der alten Kirche aufgefasst worden, auch von solchen, die sie für unglaubwürdig halten und den 'Wunderbeweis' unserer Evangelisten für Jesu 'Göttlichkeit' ablehnen. Aber diese Auffassung wird schwerlich unseren Evangelisten gerecht. Keine Wundererzählung will einen Machtbeweis Jesu als solchen darstellen, jede will vielmehr den Inhalt und Sinn seines Tuns beschreiben, ebenso, wie sein Wort einen ganz bestimmten Inhalt und Sinn hatte. In der Erzählung vom Aussätzigen spiegelte sich der Kampf Jesu um das Gesetz (v. 4): in der folgenden Erzählung (v. 5-13) wird Jesu Weg zu den Heiden, in der nächsten (v. 14-17) sein Weg ans Kreuz aufgezeigt" . . . KLIJN, *Inleiding tot het N.T.*, p. 28, says that Mark states that the man became aware of Jesus' Messiahship through the healing. Matthew does not say this. The account in Mt. has become "an example illustrating that Jesus remained faithful to the temple." Jesus' act acquires an instructive character.

must not be regarded as a certain field in which Jesus' attitude with regard to the law was as it were demonstrated, but it happened as a deed of mercy, Mk. 1 : 41.

It is understandable that the story lends itself excellently to symbolic exegesis, considering the many suitable elements which it contains. However, we will not deal with these here.

The Evangelists wanted to relate a healing of a miraculous nature. Not a single "natural" explanation can offer a satisfactory solution. Two ways thus remain open: either the account is regarded as unhistorical, or its historicity and thus its miraculous nature are accepted. Against the background of what is said in the Old Testament about leprosy and of what is also known from elsewhere about this disease, a particular light falls on the miracle.

The data available to us do not permit us to pronounce anything more than a *non liquet* regarding the nature of the disease. It is possible that the man suffered from what is nowadays called leprosy; it is equally possible that he had been attacked by a skin disease with malignant symptoms. Even if the latter were so, the healing would have been none the less marvellous for that.

Jesus' command to the man to show himself to the priest must in the first place be regarded as a necessity on behalf of the healed man himself. The addition "a testimony unto them" can best be interpreted as "a testimony against them," i.e. as incriminating evidence against them.¹

Although the account also displays the character of a sign, it will primarily have to be interpreted as a revelation of Jesus' salutary power, as a function of His Messianic Kingship. The salvation that His Kingdom brings comes powerfully to the fore not only in the healing of the man but also in the way in which He breaks through the cultic and ritual regulations.

(e) *The healing of the ten lepers*

The account of the healing of ten lepers has been preserved only in Luke 17 : 11-19.² It attracts notice again and again, because of the part which one of the healed lepers, a Samaritan, plays in the story.

¹ Cf. Jn. 5 : 36: "But I have greater witness (*μαρτυρίαν*) than that of John: for the works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same works that I do, bear witness (*μαρτυρεῖ*) of me, that the Father hath sent me." Cf. also 15 : 24: "If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both seen and hated both me and my Father."

² According to DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 117, we are not concerned

(a) *Exegetic comments.* In the first place we must ask whether this is an independent account or a variant. BULTMANN and KLOSTERMANN are of the opinion that Luke 17 : 11-19 is a variant of Mk. 1 : 40-45 and parallel passages. BULTMANN remarks that the composition forms one whole, but that it is secondary, of Hellenistic origin and based on the miracle story in Mk. 1 : 40-45.¹ The arguments adduced by these exegetes are based on debatable premises. For instance, where, when and how did the Hellenistic origin come about, and who was responsible for it? There is not the slightest objection to maintaining the independent nature of the account.

The incident occurred during Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, i.e. in the closing period of His life. For the third time the Holy City is stated as the destination, cf. Lk. 9 : 51 and 13 : 22. Probably Luke combined several journeys into one, which may appear from 10 : 38-42. For what is related there took place closer to Jerusalem than the event recounted in Lk. 17.² The route was "through the midst" of Samaria and Galilee, i.e. along the boundary between or in the borderlands of these provinces. The translation "right across Samaria and Galilee" is not correct. If the latter were the case, Jesus would have been moving away from Jerusalem instead of approaching the capital.³

DALMAN has tried to retrace the route which Jesus followed. The question is: where did the boundary run? It is difficult to imagine a trip "along a boundary;" a road comes to mind more easily.

in Luke 17 : 11-19 with a paradigm, nor with a Novelle or a legend. It is a "story" about a grateful Samaritan. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 33, classifies it among the biographical apophthegms.

¹ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 33: "Die Geschichte Mk. 1, 40-45 ist also zu einer idealen Szene verwendet, in der Dankbarkeit und Undankbarkeit in einem eindrucksvollen Bilde dargestellt werden." According to KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, this is "doubtless" a variant: he points to the: "Steigerung der Zahl der Kranken," to the: "universalistische Tendenz (Wernle) in der Einführung des Samariters," whilst he also communicates the opinion held by Maltzer (*Protest. Monatshefte*, XXV, 198 ff.): originally this was a parable "vom dankbaren Samariter."

² See KEULERS, Marcus en Lucas. PLUMMER, *St. Luke*, speaks of "The Journeys towards Jerusalem." With Lk. 17 : 11-19 "the last portion of the long section (IX. 51-XIX.28)" begins.

³ διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας. Some mss. have μέσον; ἀνὰ μέσον or διὰ μεσοῦ. MOFFATT translates: "that he passed between Samaria and Galilee." PLUMMER, *St. Luke*: "It means 'through what lies between,' i.e. along the frontier, or simply 'between'." KLOSTERMANN, op. cit., it does not mean "mitten durch," but "zwischen," "auf der Grenze hin" d.h. in der Richtung nach Peräa und schliesslich Jerusalem."

DALMAN points to the "great plain," which forms an extensive space between Galilee and Samaria, and the actual start of which must be taken from the mountain country lying on both sides. Now if Jesus, going in the direction of Jerusalem, travelled on that plain, this might be described as "passing through the midst of Samaria and Galilee."¹

The village where the encounter between Jesus and the lepers took place is not mentioned by name; Luke several times fails to give the names of villages.² As He entered this village, "there met him ten men that were lepers." The situation must have been such that these men were close to the village, since otherwise they could not have "met" Him. It was a fairly large group of people, sharing a pitiful lot.³ The remark that the men "stood afar off" indicates that they were obeying the legal regulations.

The sick men took the initiative. "And they lifted up their voices, and said, Jesus, Master, have mercy on us," verse 13. They had to "lift up" their voices in view of the distance between them and Jesus, and these raised voices are also indicative of the men's emotional state and the force of their plea.⁴ The fact that they mentioned

¹ DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 222 ff.: "In der Lage des unbekannten Dorfes in der 'grossen Ebene' wird wohl auch der Schlüssel für die Ortsbestimmung bei Lukas liegen." Small villages on the plain, such as Tarbeneth, 'affüle, el-füle: "allenfalls auch sölem (Sunem), kämen in Frage, da konnten wohl jüdische Aussätzige mit einem Samaritaner bettelnd zusammenhalten" . . . The "passing through" can be reduced to the Hebrew and Aramaic 'abar, so that it may therefore mean "ebensowohl ein blosses Vorüberziehen." "Die palästinisch-syrische Übersetzung trifft wohl das von Lukas Gemeinte mit ihrem bemis'at schämerajin ugellā 'in der Mitte von Samarien und Galilāa.' Die Peschita übersetzt: bēt schämerājē lagel lā, was wohl heissen soll: 'im Gebiet der Samariter nach Galilāa zu', da ein Weg durch dies Gebiet nach Galilāa nicht in Frage kommt, wenn das Ziel Jerusalem ist." ZAHN, *Einleitung in das N.T.*, II, p. 397: "Mitten zwischen Samarien und Galilāa, auf der Grenze hin zog Jesus, natürlich von Westen nach Osten, um in der Gegend von Skythopolis über den Jordan nach Perāa und weiter nach Jerusalem zu reisen. So kam es, dass in einem der Grenzdörfer 9 jüdische mit einem samaritischen Aussätzigen Jesu begegneten. Hieran könnte sich 13, 22-35, obwohl Lc dies vorangestellt hat, anschliessen, wenn der Schauplatz Perāa ist." Zahn therefore also wishes to combine the scattered accounts of the journey to Jerusalem (Lk. 9 : 51). See also KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 307 f.

² See Lk. 5 : 12; 9 : 52, 56; 11 : 1; 13 : 10; 14 : 1. . . . See the preceding note for villages that may qualify.

³ In 2 Ki. 7 : 3 the group consists of four lepers. PLUMMER, *op. cit.*, remarks: "These ten may have collected on hearing that Jesus was approaching. No meaning is to be sought in the number." Cf. HAUCK, *TWNT*, II, p. 36.

⁴ Cf. Lk. 11 : 27; Ac. 4 : 24; Judg. 21 : 2; 1 Sa. 11 : 4.

Jesus by name and invoked His aid demonstrates that Jesus' fame as a healer was widespread, see Lk. 7 : 22. The title "Master" appears several times in the third Gospel.¹ PLUMMER and KLOSTERMANN believe that Jesus' attention was first drawn to the deplorable state of the men by their cries for help; it is equally possible that Jesus had noticed them before.² However this may have been, Jesus took pity on them forthwith, speaking words few in number but full of significance: "Go shew yourselves unto the priests," verse 14. In this case He therefore commanded the sick to show themselves to the priests before healing, whereas in Mk. 1 : 40-45 the leper is first healed and then given the command. It seems obvious to assume that the Jewish men had to go to the priests in their places of residence, or at least to those living the closest to those places, whereas the Samaritan had to show himself to a Samaritan priest, according to PLUMMER the priest of the temple on Mount Gerizim.³ KLOSTERMANN likewise believes that the Samaritan had to go to the Samaritan priest, but thinks that the others had to make for the temple in Jerusalem, a theory which we do not consider probable.⁴ The Evangelist

¹ ἐπιστάτα, rabbi: see Lk. 5 : 5; 8 : 24, 45; 9 : 33, 49; 17 : 13. See ΟΕΡΚΕ, TWNT, II, p. 619 f.; DALMAN, Die Worte Jesu, p. 276; STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 157.

² PLUMMER, op. cit.: "and directly he saw: which seems to imply that, until they cried out, He had not perceived who they were." KLOSTERMANN, Das Lukasevangelium. "Jesus erblickt sie erst infolge ihres Rufens." According to VON HARNACK, Marcion, Beil., p. 223, in his "gospel" Marcion inserted in the text here, "zwar wohl vor" πορευθέντες, the words from Lk. 4 : 27: "And many lepers were in Israel in the time of Eliseus the prophet; and none of them was cleansed, saving Naaman the Syrian" . . . Did he do so to stress the contrast between the God of the Old Testament, with His few healings, and the God of the New Testament, with His many healings? In TERTULLIAN, Adv. Marc., IV, 35, Marcion depicts the Christ as "rival" (aemulus) of the law and "as it were mocker at the law" (quasi legis illusor), because He had healed the lepers on their way and so taken from the priests the work entrusted to them by the law . . . But here Marcion forgets the difference between "cleansing" (healing) and "pronouncing clean."

³ PLUMMER, op. cit. "Each of the ten would go to the priest near his own home . . . The Samaritan would go to a priest of the temple on Mount Gerizim." HAUCK, Das Lukasevangelium. "Priester waren auch in den Orten des Landes (1, 23) anzutreffen: für den Samariter kam ein samaritischer in Frage." GREYDANUS, Lukas, says that they were free to go to the priest of their choice. He does not think it probable that Jesus meant a Samaritan priest for the Samaritan. Considering the behaviour of this Samaritan: "we may ask whether he was not a believer in God who knew and served Israel's God, the only true God."

⁴ KLOSTERMANN, Das Lukasevangelium. ". . . die andern wegen des zwar nicht erwähnten, aber doch notwendigen Opfers (vgl. 5, 14b) zum Tempel in Jerusalem." PAULUS, Exegetisches Handbuch, II, p. 628 ff., is of the opinion that people

has nothing to say about oral reactions to Jesus' command; he merely states that "it came to pass, that, as they went, they were cleansed," verse 14.¹

The ten men must without exception have had the fullest confidence in Jesus' power as a healer, since they obeyed His command at once. While they were on their way to the priests, they were "cleansed." This does not mean that they first became clean after they had been pronounced clean by the priests; it means that they were cleansed, i.e. healed, en route. Some believe that the healing happened gradually; however, and instantaneous recovery must be envisaged. Doubtless the men discovered at a given moment that they themselves and their fellows had been healed. It seems unacceptable that the healings took place at different times.

The first part of the account thus ends with the report of the miraculous healing. In the part that follows, verses 15-19, the reactions of the healed men are related. Ten men were healed, but only one of them: "when he saw that he was healed, turned back, and with a loud voice glorified God, And fell down on his face at his feet, giving him thanks: and he was a Samaritan," verses 15, 16. Luke clearly says: "when he saw that he was healed," which strengthens the view defended above that the healing happened en route. DALMAN is therefore correct in opposing K.L. Schmidt's view that the place of the encounter between Jesus and the lepers was closer to Jerusalem, since the quick return of that one healed man, after the cleansing rites at the priest's place of residence, would have precluded a long journey. According to DALMAN the healing was not conditional on complete fulfilment of Jesus' command, but on the pious obedience with which the command was acted upon. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that a fairly long absence of

no longer went to the priests as much as formerly. "Die verdächtigen Hautkranken wurden freilich von der Gesellschaft der Gesunden ausgeschlossen, weil diesen selbst so viel daran lag. Aber zum Priester zu gehen, hatte, wenigstens hier, eine ganze Truppe von Zehn nicht für der Mühe werth gehalten. Jesus muntert sie dazu auf. *Mehr sagt die Geschichte nicht!*" None of them had done that yet, but now that they do it, the result proves to be: "dass sie alle für rein (d.h. für nicht ansteckend, für nicht ausgeschlossen von der Gesellschaft) erklärt werden konnten und wirklich erklärt wurden." This rationalistic view is also held by PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 388: "Er schickt sie zur Begutachtung zu den Priestern, die sie für rein erklären. Jesus meint, ihr Glaube habe die plötzliche Heilung bewirkt."

¹ PAULUS, *op. cit.*, II, p. 630. "As they went" does not mean "whilst they were leaving," but: "da sie zu den Priestern deswegen hingingen."

the healed man could have hampered or delayed a second encounter with Jesus.¹

As soon as the man saw his benefactor, he began to glorify God "with a loud voice." Even while he approached, in emotional mood he voiced his deep gratitude. It is improbable that, now he knew he was healed, he would still have kept the distance prescribed for lepers. Moreover, he threw himself at Jesus' feet. His Samaritan origin is emphasized: and *he* was a Samaritan!² Before Jesus addressed the one man who had returned, He pronounced judgment in the form of two questions and a statement on those who had continued the journey. "Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine? There are not found that returned to give glory to God, save this stranger," verses 17 and 18. The first question shows that Jesus had wanted all ten men to be healed. His compassionate love was all-embracing. The second question related to those who had not returned. It cannot be said with certainty whether "the nine" were all Jews, but it may be taken almost for granted. PLUMMER says that these questions reveal Jesus' surprise and His limited knowledge, whilst KLOSTERMANN thinks of resentment.³ Why had

¹ DALMAN, op. cit., p. 225. For the view of K. L. Schmidt, see his *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 251 f. Dalman comments on this point: "Aber das 'Reinwerden' bedeutet wie Luk. 4, 27; 5, 13; 7, 22 die Heilung, und es geschieht nach Luk. 17, 14 schon auf dem Wege. Das Natürliche bleibt die sofortige Umkehr des Dankbaren, der noch vor dem priesterlichen Akte dem Lobe Gottes und dem Danke gegen seinen Gesandten Ausdruck geben will. Nicht die vollendete Ausführung des Befehles Jesu, sondern der gläubige Gehorsam war die Vorbedingung der Heilung. Dann lässt Jesu Zusammentreffen mit den Aussätzigen sich in der von Lukas angedeuteten Gegend sehr wohl denken. Gerade wenn es vom Orte der Heilung noch weit nach Jerusalem war, ist die Umkehr zu Jesus um so erklärlicher. Er war dann am sichersten noch zu treffen und die Hinausschiebung des Dankes eine um so schwerer drückende Last." Cf. PLUMMER, op. cit. "It was because he *saw* (ἰδὼν) that he was *healed* (not after he had been *declared* to be clean) that he came back to give thanks . . . It is most improbable that he did not *see* that he was cleansed till the priest told him that he was."

² καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Σαμαρίτης. PLUMMER, op. cit. "Here the αὐτός has point: 'and *he* was a Samaritan.' The only one who exhibited gratitude was a despised schismatic. That *all* the others were Jews is not implied." Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*. One should remember the foreigner Naaman, 2 Ki. 5. . . . As regards the relation between Jews and Samaritans, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, pp. 538-560; SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, II, pp. 14-18; J. JEREMIAS, *TWNT*, VII, p. 88 ff.

³ PLUMMER, op. cit., points out that τοῦ is placed at the end to give it emphasis: the nine — where (are they)? "These questions imply surprise, and surprise implies limitation of knowledge" (VII. 9; Mt. VIII. 10; Mk. VI. 6)." KLOSTERMANN, op. cit. "Die erste Hälfte der Frage bei Lc drückt nicht eine Ungewissheit Jesu, sondern nur seinen Unwillen aus."

the Jews not returned? Did they want to hear the priests' opinion as quickly as possible, and did they long to be reunited with their families? Had they agreed among themselves that they would first go to the priest and then return to Jesus? Speculations such as these can be made, but they have little or no point.

The statement related to the man who had returned. Luke does not say how Jesus knew that this man was not a Jew. Jesus calls him "this stranger:" he is of "another people."¹ This pronouncement is significant proof of the fact that the gulf between Jews and Samaritans was indeed great. The Samaritan returned to give "glory" to God, which means here to thank Him for His benefaction.²

After these words Jesus addressed Himself to the man who lay at His feet: "Arise, go thy way: thy faith hath made thee whole." BULTMANN and others see in these words an editorial addition, but they do not give valid reasons for this view.³ And, supposing that the account had ended on the rhetorical note of Jesus' words, would not the event again have been regarded as "suspect," on the very grounds of such an ending? The words to the man form an appropriate conclusion to the whole. The healed man learns the essence from Jesus, viz. that his faith has made him whole, cf. Lk. 7 : 50; 8 : 48, 50; 18 : 42. For — as we have commented elsewhere — it is not the healing as such, but faith in the healer that guarantees that the healed person is saved, and "saved" must be taken here in the sense of salvation.⁴

¹ See PLUMMER, op. cit. The text has ἀλλογενής. The classical word would be ἀλλοφύλος (Ac. 10 : 28, but ἀλλογενής often occurs in the Septuagint, especially for the pagans (Ex. 12 : 43; 29 : 33; 30 : 33; Lev. 22 : 10, etc.). Cf. BÜCHSEL, TWNT, I, p. 266 f.

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 235: "Die Wendung bedeutet: Gott anerkennende Ehre oder ehrende Anerkennung geben. Das kann je nach den Umständen auf verschiedene Weise geschehen: durch Lobpreisung Jes 42, 12; Ps 9, 1; Offb 4, 9; 19, 7; durch Danksagung Lk 17, 18 (vgl. Vers 15 u. 16); durch Bekennen der Wahrheit Jos 7, 19; Joh 9, 24; durch Anerkennung der Majestät u. des Willens Gottes 1 Sm 6, 5; Apg 12, 23; Offb 11, 13; 14, 7; durch Busse u. Bekehrung zu Gott Jer 13, 16; Offb 16, 9; durch gläubiges Vertrauen auf Gottes Verheissung Rom 4, 20." STAUFFER, Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments, p. 100 ff. "Die Rettungswunder, die Jesus in der Zeit seiner Wirksamkeit vollbringt, dienen der Ehre Gottes. Das Volk rühmt Gott (L 7, 16; 18, 43) und die Geheilten danken ihm (L. 13, 13; 17, 15; 18, 43). Jesus selbst erwartet und will es so (L. 17, 17 f.)." Cf. p. 148. Only the one who returned grasped the significance of what had happened.

³ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 33: "Übrigens ist Vers 19 ein schematischer, vielleicht erst von der Redaktion angehängter Schluss." KLOSTERMANN, Das Lukasevangelium. HAUCK, Lukas.

⁴ GREYDANUS, Lukas. The man was saved: "for all eternity, in the fullest sense,

KEULERS rightly considers it a misjudgment of Jesus' goodness if an attempt is made to deduce from His words to the grateful Samaritan that the nine others were afflicted again with leprosy as a punishment.¹

A correct diagnosis of the disease from which the men had suffered cannot be given. It is quite acceptable that they had been afflicted by various malignant — in some cases perhaps benign — skin complaints. It is also well within the bounds of possibility that some of them were suffering from leprosy in the modern sense. But no-one will ever advance beyond guesses and surmises.²

Conclusions. When arriving at conclusions one is guided by a whole body of considerations. If one is guided by what might be called an overall view, this will play a decisive part in the final judgment. The rationalist PAULUS, as we have seen, had relatively little trouble with his solution to the story. The same applies to STRAUSS, to whom this is simply a myth. FENNER, who, in the footsteps of Strauss, points to Old Testament examples, considers it unacceptable that Jews and Samaritans mixed, and thinks it impossible that a Samaritan would have had to show himself to the Jewish authorities.³ However, it might be asked where the latter is said or demanded.

Although BULTMANN speaks of a "presumed" Hellenistic origin, he fails to adduce the slightest proof of his theory.⁴

Another question is whether the account was composed by the Evangelist from a certain point of view. Was it his intention to spotlight the gratitude of only one of the healed men, with the additional tragic fact that this man was a foreigner? Developing this thesis further, might it not be supposed that the Samaritan's gratitude was incorporated in a striking historicized setting? With justice it is repeatedly remarked that the description reaches a climax in the gratitude displayed by the Samaritan.⁵ However, it is quite

by his faith in the Lord." STAUFFER, *op. cit.*, p. 148: "Der Glaube sucht mehr als nur die Rettung aus Krankheit und Lebensgefahr. Seine letzte Erfüllung ist der Friede Gottes (L 7, 48 ff.; 8, 48; 17, 19)."

¹ KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*.

² EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 90: "Welche Form von Aussatz, d.h. welche Art von Hautveränderung diese Männer auch gehabt haben mögen, eine wissenschaftliche Deutung der Art der Heilung vermögen wir nicht zu geben."

³ FENNER, *op. cit.*, p. 67 f. "So muss damit gerechnet werden, dass man nach alttestamentlichem Vorbild, Ex. 12, 10 ff., 4 Reg. 5, auch Jesus Aussätzigenheilungen zugeschrieben hat."

⁴ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 33; cf. pp. 64, 254.

⁵ Cf. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, p. 34: "The story is obviously meant to illustrate that only one of the lepers does what all of them should really

incorrect to put too much weight on this part of the text, since this throws the whole out of balance. For Luke 17 : 11-19 does not tell the story of a grateful Samaritan, as for instance BULTMANN and DIBELIUS emphasize, but it relates the healing of ten lepers.¹ It is the healing that forms the essential content of the text! And from this healing we can see how great Jesus' power to heal was, and how far His mercy extended. We shall therefore have to think in the first place here of the saving function of the Kingdom of God.

However, the express nature of Jesus' benefaction to all finds a tragic antithesis in the lack of gratitude on the part of almost all. There is the danger of our failing to see this tragedy of ingratitude if too much attention is devoted to the one man who did show his gratitude, as often happens. In our opinion the stress can with equal justice be laid on the "nine ungrateful ones."

Now how must the second part, verses 15-19, be understood? Confining ourselves to the Gospel of Luke, we believe that this contains sufficient comparative material to obtain the correct view of the whole of the text. For we note that, in those accounts in which the healings are described in greater detail, these miracles are rarely "reported" merely as happenings in the strictly matter-of-fact sense, but that there is always one or the other important "additional event," a spiritual "event" which accompanies the actual occurrence of the miracle, bringing it out in full relief, and which may make it a "sign." The healing of the paralytic, Lk. 5 : 17-26, is accompanied by the spectacular "event" of the forgiveness of sins. It is on the latter point that the discussion between Jesus and the Jewish leaders develops. The healing of the man with the withered hand, Lk. 6 : 6-11, is accompanied by the question of the Sabbath. The same applies to the healing of the woman bowed together, Lk. 13 : 10-17, and to that of the man with dropsy, Lk. 14 : 1-6. Practically every miracle of Jesus is accompanied by a more or less important additional

have done . . . It is explicitly said that it might also be expected of the others that they would not forget to be grateful and to give glory to God (verse 18)."

¹ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, pp. 33; 59; 235. DIBELIUS, *op. cit.*, p. 117: "Es ist eine Erzählung von der Anerkennung eines Samariters und seiner Frömmigkeit durch Jesus. Von diesem Interesse aus ist sie formuliert, das zeigt 17, 18 mit dem Hinweis auf den 'Fremdbürtigen': unter diesem Gesichtspunkt ist sie von Lukas aufbewahrt, das zeigt ihre Einordnung und Einleitung durch den Evangelisten. Die Entstehung dieser Legende und ihren geschichtlichen Wert zu charakterisieren, ist uns verwehrt." MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 47: the point here is the Samaritan's gratitude.

event, and mention is made of favourable or unfavourable reactions from various quarters. The above data help us to recognize the balance in the story contained in Lk. 17 : 11-19, and make us realize that DIBELIUS, with his view that Luke formulated the account "out of sympathy" for the grateful and pious Samaritan, fails to appreciate the real content of the text. For, however interesting and striking the additional event, viz. the absence and the display of gratitude, may be, particularly in the tragic sign of sinful reaction from the human side to the action of mercy from God's side, it may nevertheless not prevail over the miraculous healing as such.

Not only does the account form a harmonious whole in itself, but it also fits perfectly into the structure of the third Gospel, with its universalistic traits. In Jesus' mercy to all the Kingdom of God manifests itself as the salvation of the whole world. This is the "sign" that this story gives us.

V. THE HEALING OF A MAN WITH DROPSY

This healing is related only by Luke, Lk. 14 : 1-6.¹ Details of time and place are just as incomplete as in the healing recounted in Lk. 13 : 10-17. It was the Sabbath, and the scene was the house of one of the chief Pharisees. It is not clear what Luke means by "one of the chief Pharisees." Does he mean one of the authorities of the Pharisees, in the sense of Hillel, Shammai and Gamaliel, or does he mean the ruler of a synagogue, cf. 8 : 41, who at the same time was a member of the party of the Pharisees? Or is Luke trying to convey the idea that the man was distinguished, influential?²

In any case, Jesus came to eat bread with one of these leaders, i.e. to have a meal consisting mainly of bread, cf. Mt. 15 : 2 and Mk. 3 : 20. It was the custom to have three meals on the Sabbath, and two on weekdays. The main meal was eaten after worship, i.e. about noon. Guests were often invited for this meal. The Sabbath was observed by eating and drinking well and by wearing fine clothes.³ We are thus concerned here with a well-to-do company, with Jesus as a guest. Jesus was "watched," which was probably a sign of concealed enmity. "And, behold, there was a certain man before him which had the dropsy." It need not be supposed that the coming of this sick man had been arranged by the host; "and, behold" implies rather the unexpected appearance of an uninvited guest, cf. Lk. 7 : 37.⁴ The entry of the unfortunate sufferer gave Jesus cause to ask the company: "Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath day?" With this question He "answered" the thoughts passing through the minds of those present. For it would not be the first time that Jesus had infringed the regulations for the sabbath!⁵

However, the company remained silent — with evil intent, in

¹ DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 40, classifies this account among the paradigms of impure type; it inclines towards the *Novelle*. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 10, places it among the apophthegms, Streit- und Schulgespräche.

² Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*. DELLING, *TWNT*, I, p. 486 ff. In Luke and John the ἀρχοντες are among other things groups in the Jewish people; in Luke they are distinguished from the elders, scribes and high priests.

³ See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 202 and I, pp. 610-615.

⁴ KEULERS, *op. cit.*, likewise thinks of an "unexpected" appearance.

⁵ Cf. Lk. 6 : 6-11; 13 : 14-16 . . . For the Sabbath conflict, see the chapter: Jesus' Miraculous Power.

embarrassment, to avoid a discussion or out of sympathy for the sick man? — cf. Mk. 3 : 4. Jesus then took the man, healed him, and let him go, cf. Lk. 8 : 38.¹ Immediately after this deed, Jesus again put a question: "Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not straightway pull him out on the Sabbath day?"² The company had nothing to say to this, cf. Lk. 13 : 17. It is remarkable that outbursts of indignation did not occur, see Lk. 6 : 11. Probably the healed man left the house before the meal; cf. verse 7, where Jesus begins to speak with reference to the "choosing" of the "chief rooms."

Talmudic literature contains a number of interesting data on dropsy (hydrops). With reference to Job 28 : 25: "and he [i.e. God] weigheth the waters by measure," the following is remarked: "Man is evenly balanced, half of him is water, and the other half is blood. When he is deserving, the water does not exceed the blood, nor does the blood exceed the water; but when he sins, it sometimes happens that the water gains over the blood and then he becomes a sufferer from dropsy; at other times the blood gains over the water and he then becomes leprous."³

Elsewhere it is stated: "Three die even while they speak: people with bowel complaints, women in childbed and those with dropsy."⁴

According to Rabbi Simeon ben Gamaliel hidrokan (dropsy) is caused by keeping back the faeces.⁵ Sexual offences were punished with dropsy.⁶ All these examples show how close a link was believed to exist between sin and dropsy.

¹ ἐπιλαμβάνομαι, cf. DELLING, TWNT, IV, p. 9: "Lk 14, 4 von der wirkungsvollen Berührung durch Jesu heilende Hand." See the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment.

² Some mss. have the combination "son or ox" or "sheep or ox" instead of "ass or ox." KEULERS, Marcus en Lucas, remarks that when a son leads an ox to the spring on a Sabbath, one of the two may fall into the water; both will be saved. See also: KLOSTERMANN, Das Lukasevangelium. Cf. Lk. 13 : 15 and Mt. 12 : 11 . . . See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 199 f., on the watering of cattle on the Sabbath.

³ Midr. Rabbah Lev., XV, 2 (transl. J. Israelstam). Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 203. ὑδρωπικός; rabb.: אֲדִרְפִּיקוּס and הִדְרִיקָן. PREUSS, op. cit., p. 190, thinks that this is: "eine Art humoralpathologische Theorie."

⁴ Erub. 41b; see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 203.

⁵ Berakoth 25a: "On account of the dictum of R. Simeon b. Gamaliel, as it has been taught: R. Simeon b. Gamaliel says: Keeping back the faeces brings on dropsy, keeping back urine brings on jaundice" (ed. Epstein; transl. M. Simon). Cf. Berakoth 62b.

⁶ Shabbath 33a: "R. Oshaia said: He who devotes himself to sin, wounds and

In his detailed description of the illness of Herod the Great, FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS states that Herod's feet were swollen by dropsy.¹

The apostle Paul is credited with the healing of a man suffering from dropsy in Myra. He is said to have healed a certain Hermocrates, "not because he desired a reward, but through the name of Jesus Christ," whereupon Hermocrates had himself and his wife baptized.² Such a healing is also ascribed to Apollonius. A young Assyrian, a habitual drinker, who as a result suffered from dropsy, begged the god Aesculapius to heal him. But he continued to drink, whereupon Aesculapius let him go and referred him to Apollonius. The latter asked him: "Do you wish to be well?" He took the man firmly in hand, gave him good advice, and the man recovered.³

Tatian tells the mournful story of a certain Heraclitus, who suffered from dropsy and busied himself with both medicine and philosophy. He coated his entire body with cow dung, which set hard and tore open his whole body, so that he died.⁴

As regards the symptoms themselves, we may mention the following. In dropsy we are not concerned with a disease as such but with a symptom of some disease or the other, just as is the case with headaches, fever and the like.⁵

All kinds of physical diseases and complaints, such as heart disease,

bruises break out over him, as it is said, Stripes and wounds are for him that devoteth himself to evil¹). Moreover, he is punished by dropsy, for it is said, and strokes reach the innermost parts of the belly. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: Dropsy is a sign of sin. Our Rabbis taught: There are three kinds of dropsy: that [which is a punishment] of sin is thick; that caused by hunger is swollen; and what is caused by magic is thin." According to Joma 66b those who in their hearts had rejoiced at the incident with the golden calf were punished with dropsy, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p: 203. Cf. also EBSTEIN, Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud, p. 267.

¹ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Antiq.*, XVII, VI, 5.

² *Acta Pauli*, 3 (see HENNECKE, *op. cit.*, p. 204).

³ *VITA APOLL.*, I, 9.

⁴ TATIAN, *Oratio ad Graecos*, 3. See VON HARNACK, *Medizinisches aus der ält. Kirchengeschichte*, p. 68 (32) . . . A strange form of therapy is reported by STRACK, *Das Blut im Glauben u. Aberglauben der Menschheit*, p. 40: "Ein Wassersüchtiger soll am rechten Arm Ader lassen, das Blut in ein ausgeblasenes Ei thun und dieses in den Mist vergraben, dass es verfault," according to Buck, *Schwaben*, 44.

⁵ PINKHOF, *Geneeskundig woordenboek*: "Hydrops, dropsy, an accumulation of serous fluid in cavities of the body and tissue spaces, caused by a stoppage in the discharge of the fluid or by a change in the composition of the blood or by both causes together." (The medical terms given by Pinkhof in the text have been omitted. He lists many forms of dropsy.)

¹ Prov. XX, 30 (ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman).

anaemia, kidney trouble, etc., may be accompanied by dropsy, so that the actual complaint from which the man was suffering is unknown.

EBSTEIN considers a natural explanation of the case reported in Lk. 14 : 1-6 to be possible, provided that it is assumed that the Evangelist compresses an event covering a longer period of time into one moment. The words "and healed him" do not therefore designate the immediate, complete recovery here, but point to the certainty of this happening. For this opinion EBSTEIN invokes Friedreich, who, on the strength of data collected from medical literature, states that "chronic dropsy, which formerly had long resisted all attempts to cure it, was healed within three days under the influence of exciting stimuli."¹ FENNER rightly remarks that the text tells us nothing about a process of healing. He himself says that sufferers from this disease are often by nature nervous, sensitive persons. Now and again a periodicity in the symptoms is observed, and also other symptoms of nervous trouble. Rest and sedation often help. FENNER considers it possible that we have here a case of *hydrops articulorum intermittens*.² MICKLEM, too, believes it to be possible that this is a functional complaint.³

It is quite feasible that the "diagnosis" of Fenner and Micklem is correct. Perhaps the man walked into the house with difficulty.⁴ In that case the statement that Jesus "took him," verse 4, might

¹ EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 96. Ebstein says of these cases: "Dieselben werden sicher vielen Laien, auch wenn sie sich der von Friedreich vorgeschlagenen, meines Erachtens durchaus annehmbaren Deutung der auf der vorhergehenden Seite aufgegebenen Stelle (Lukas 14, 2) anschliessen, als wunderbare Heilungen erscheinen." (J. B. Friedreich, *Zur Bibel. Naturhistorische, anthropologische und medizinische Fragmente*, Nürnberg, 1843.) It is interesting to note how the one doctor, Ebstein, says with regard to Friedreich's investigation: it is quite feasible, whereas Dr. Preuss, in his critical comments, has Friedreich particularly in mind: "Die Ausleger haben nicht geruht, bis sie Fälle ausfindig gemacht haben, in denen gleichfalls durch eine starke seelische Einwirkung wassersüchtige Schwellungen zum verschwinden gebracht wurden" (*op. cit.*, p. 191).

² FENNER, *op. cit.* "Es ist aber möglich, an *Hydrops articulorum intermittens* oder *Hypostrophus articulorum* zu denken, eine trophische Neurose, bei der ohne Fieber und ohne äussere Veranlassung Ergüsse in den serösen Gelenkhäuten (auch Sehnnenscheiden) entstehen, gelegentlich mit Oedem der umliegenden Haut" (p. 66).

³ MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*. "There is a disease known as *Angio Neurotic Oedema*, which I understand to be a functional complaint. It is possible that a man suffering from this would be termed ὑδρωπικός" (p. 126).

⁴ According to PINKHOF, *op. cit.*, *hydrops articulorum intermittens* particularly affects the knee joints.

acquire an additional stress: Jesus offered the man a helping hand.

And yet, even if surmises and reconstructions point to such a possibility, there is still the problem of the immediate recovery. And here the full stress must fall on "recovery," having regard to the question which Jesus put to the company about saving an ass or an ox on the Sabbath, for these too are not partly pulled out of the pit! Jesus did not let the man go on the way to recovery, but let him go healed.¹ We can hardly see this healing as anything but a healing miracle, in which firstly the saving love of Jesus is revealed as a present and concrete reality, and secondly the sign is given that Jesus is "Lord" of the Sabbath.

¹ An example of a pathetic description of this healing is to be found in ARNOBIUS, *Adv. Gentes*, I, 45. In his eulogy of the healings of Jesus he says: "Was He one of us, whose hands the waters of the lethargic dropsy fled from, and that searching fluid avoided; and did the swelling body, assuming a healthy dryness, find relief?"

VI. THE HEALING OF THE WOMAN WITH THE ISSUE OF BLOOD

The account of the healing of Jairus' daughter is interrupted by the report of the healing of the woman who had suffered from an issue of blood for twelve years. The Synoptists have handed down both accounts to us intermingled, which is a point in favour of both a fixed place in tradition and their historicity.¹ Matthew is very matter-of-fact and concise in his account.

Whilst Jesus was on His way to the house of the ruler of the synagogue with His disciples, and surrounded by a large multitude,² He was secretly touched by a sick woman. In the ninth century a block of stone and a cross on a road at Capernaum still showed the place where this was said to have happened.³ The Synoptists unanimously state that the woman had suffered from an issue of blood for twelve years. However, this tells us nothing about the complaint itself. PREUSS therefore believes that it is "pointless" to discuss the causes of the complaint.⁴ EBSTEIN is on the other hand of the opinion that the woman may have been haemorrhaging from the womb. Such chronic haemorrhages may stop very suddenly, but they can also return.⁵ SENG remarks that menstrual haemorrhages from mental causes are well known nowadays. Many exegetes there-

¹ Mt. 9 : 20-22; Mk. 5 : 25-34; Lk. 8 : 43-48. Cf. SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 148: "... hier hat die wirkliche Erinnerung einen geschichtlichen Tatbestand festgehalten: die Heilung der Frau hat sich auf dem Wege zum Hause des Jairus ereignet." MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 120 f.: "There are few narratives in the Gospels which bear such marks of historical accuracy as does this record. It is psychologically thoroughly convincing." KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, regards the intermingling as the editor's work. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 68, classifies the account among the "Novellen;" both accounts are closely connected to one another. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 228, puts it among the "Wundergeschichten." It is: "zwei ursprünglich isolierte Wundergeschichten."

² Mk. 5 : 24; Lk. 8 : 42.

³ DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 149.

⁴ PREUSS, *op. cit.* "Die meisten Erklärer nehmen an, dass es sich um eine chronische Gebärmutterblutung gehandelt habe, einzelne haben auch an Hämorrhoids gedacht. Darüber zu diskutieren, ist zwecklos, ebenso wie über die anatomische Ursache der Blutung, die bei Metrorrhagien ja mannigfach sein kann" (p. 439).

⁵ EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 97 f.

fore seek the solution of the symptoms in this direction, but we know nothing of the real cause of the loss of blood.¹

The reason why the woman touched Jesus unobserved lay in the fact that a woman suffering from haemorrhages was pronounced unclean by the law.² Some doubt the number of years stated for the illness, pointing to the coincidence with the age of Jairus' daughter.³

Whilst Matthew in his matter-of-fact account, informs us of the woman's act at once, Mark and Luke report in detail the woman's wretched state. She had been to doctor after doctor, which had cost her all she had without helping her; instead, she had grown worse, Mark 5 : 26. Luke leaves the doctors out of it — deliberately? — and merely states that she could be healed by nobody, Lk. 8 : 43. That the woman "had suffered many things of many physicians" is quite understandable when we consider the methods of treatment and the medicines applied to an illness such as this! The Talmud has preserved a wide selection of the strangest "prescriptions." They were not only so-called popular remedies; the doctors used them too!⁴ A few

¹ SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 18 . . . TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 20, speaks of too great a flux through lack of health. "Itaque non temere interpretata est sibi legem, ea contaminari significantem quae essent contaminabilia, non deum, quem in Christo confidebat. Sed et illud recogitavit, ordinarium et sollemnem menstrui vel partialis sanguinis fluxum in lege taxari qui veniat ex officio naturae, non ex vitio valetudinis. Illa autem ex vitio valetudinis redundabat, cui non modum temporis, sed divinae misericordiae auxilium necessarium sciebat. Atque ita potest videri legem non inrupisse, sed distinxisse." MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 344: the woman was suffering from "persistent haemorrhage." MICKLEM, *op. cit.*, p. 120: it was definitely "menorrhagia," i.e. increased menstrual bleeding. EITREM, *Demonology*, p. 35, says that it was probably menorrhagia. VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 408 ff., thinks that what is meant is a chronic venereal disease. WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, second Discourse, p. (8), remarks that the issue of blood is nowhere defined exactly. It was probably of a menstrual nature, but it might also have been "only a little bleeding at the Nose."

² See Lev. 15 : 25 ff. . . . For details cf. the Mishna tractate Zabim; STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 520. TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 20, argues at length that the woman did not infringe the law, for she knew that God preferred mercy to sacrificial offerings and that she could not defile God in Christ. See note 1.

³ MICKLEM, *op. cit.*, p. 121. . . . During the first centuries of Christianity the holders of heterodox opinions used a dozen years in their numerology as characteristic of certain ideas; see IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, I, 3, 3; II, 20, 1; II, 23, 1. The woman herself was regarded by followers of Valentinus as a symbol of outflowing Wisdom, see ORIGEN, *c. Celsum*, VI, 35.

⁴ PREUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 439: "Aus dem Talmud erfahren wir eine ganze Reihe von den Heilmitteln, die das Volk und wohl auch die Ärzte jener Zeit gegen den Blutfluss anzuwendenden pflegten. Dass bei einem so eminent chronischen Leiden

prescriptions may serve as an illustration. The woman suffering from this complaint, who was called "zabah," could find a remedy in for instance the drinking of a goblet of wine containing a powder made from rubber, alum and garden crocuses. Or she was given a draught of Persian onions cooked in wine, whilst at the same time she was summoned to "Arise out of your issue of blood!" Attempts were also made to heal her by giving her a sudden shock, or she was ordered to carry the ash of an ostrich's egg in a certain cloth, etc.¹

Despite her ritual uncleanness, the woman was thus "in the press."² At a given moment she touched Jesus' garment, or the border of His garment respectively, from behind.³ Up to this point the Evangelists agree on the whole with one other, but from then on considerable differences occur. Matthew relates the woman's thoughts: "If I may but touch his garment, I shall be whole," Mt. 9 : 21, cf. Mk. 5 : 28. Mark and Luke then state that the secret contact with Jesus' clothing brought about immediate healing,⁴ whereas according

die Zahl der Mittel nicht klein sein wird, und dass dabei auch die 'sympathetischen Kuren' nicht zu kurz kommen werden, ist von vornherein zu erwarten." CHAJES, *Markus-Studien*, p. 36, considers the explanation that in Mk. 5 : 26 distrust of contemporary physicians is manifested to be inadequate. In his opinion the text is polemic in nature, "und so meine ich, dass diese Sentenz einem antiessenischen Geiste entspringt." For the Essenes seem to have engaged in therapy on a medical basis; the disciples of Jesus, on the other hand, healed in "supranaturalistic" fashion . . . As regards the physician's fee, mention is already made of that in Ex. 21 : 19. BEER, *Exodus*, translates: "die Heilkosten ersetzen."

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 520, Sabb. 110a. PREUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 439 f.

² Mk. 5 : 27. VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 408, says that a woman suffering from venereal disease really ought to have lived in retirement, but that she was allowed to mix with people in a place like Capernaum, where Jews and pagans lived.

³ Mk. 5 : 27: "his garment" (ἱμάτιον, vestimentum). Mt. 9 : 20 and Lk. 8 : 44: "the hem [border] of his garment," τὸ κράσπεδον τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ . . . In Nu. 15 : 37 ff. references are made to the fringe (פְּתִילֵי; LXX: τὰ κράσπεδα, fimbria). Every Israelite was obliged to wear "memorial tassels," one tassel at each of the four corners of his outer garment, so that he would be reminded of the Lord's commandments by the sight of these tassels. Deu. 22 : 12 speaks of "fringes" (פְּתִילֵי; στρεπτά) on the four quarters of the vesture. They could easily be touched unnoticed. For details see STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1, pp. 277-292; SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, II, p. 484; SCHNEIDER, TWNT, III, p. 904.

⁴ Mk. 5 : 29: καὶ εὐθὺς ἐξηράνθη ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς. MICHAELIS, TWNT, VI, p. 116, comments with regard to this: "Dabei wird nicht gemeint sein, dass die Quelle, das heisst der Ursprung ihres Blutflusses, beseitigt wurde, sondern das wie eine Quelle ständig rinnende Blut versiegte, es kam kein Blut mehr." Lk. 8 : 44: καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστη ἡ ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς. Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 520, on the touching of the clothes worn by a person of standing;

to Matthew the healing did not happen until Jesus had spoken to the woman, Mt. 9 : 22. This fundamental difference cannot be eliminated in any way. In Matthew we have a healing like so many others — healing took place upon Jesus' word — whereas Mark and Luke mention a detail which has caused scholars a great deal of perplexity.¹ For according to Mk. 5 : 30 and Lk. 8 : 46, Jesus felt "virtue" go forth from Him and tried to find out who had touched Him. We have a number of questions about this.

(a) What idea must we form here of the "virtue" of Jesus? Was Jesus "charged" with power, and could power be withdrawn from Him, if necessary in secret? STRAUSS says that this text is a crux for both orthodox investigators and rationalists: Jesus seems to be a kind of mesmerist. He neatly remarks that we are reminded of "a charged battery which discharges itself when touched."² STRAUSS goes on to make the shrewd comment that attempts have been made to explain away the difficulties by approaching the text from a contemporary "Christian consciousness." To eliminate the idea of an outflowing force, it is then asserted that Jesus had a constant, universal will to heal.³ However, if the concept "force," "power," "virtue" is investigated in the whole of the proclamation of the Old and the New Testament, it will be noted that here we are concerned with something quite different from being charged with force, from

see further the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment . . . BLOCH, *Les Rois Thaumaturges*, mentions the following interesting passage from the *Historia Francorum*, IX, c. 21, by Gregory of Tours, concerning King Goutran: "On racontait communément parmi les fidèles qu'une femme, dont le fils, souffrant d'une fièvre quartaine, gisait sur son lit de douleur, s'était glissée à travers la foule jusqu'au roi et, l'approchant par derrière, lui avait arraché sans qu'il s'en aperçut quelques franges de son manteau royale; elle les mit dans de l'eau et fit boire cette eau à son fils; aussitôt la fièvre tomba; le malade guérit" (p. 33). Gregory does not doubt the truth of this account. LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle*, p. 468, points out how: "le docteur Angélique dans Saint-Pierre" brought healing to: "une femme hémorroïsse par le contact du bord de sa tunique."

¹ VON AMMON, *op. cit.*, p. 412, is of the opinion that Luke wanted to "magnify" the miracle. PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 525, believes that Luke 8 : 46 originally read: "Somebody hath touched me, for I have felt it." Later people began to wonder what He felt, and how. Then the words "that virtue is gone out of me" were added. Paulus again sees in this the confusion of fact and opinion. ALLEN, *St. Matthew*, remarks with reference to Mt. 9 : 22: "In these words the editor summarises Mt. V v. 30-34." KEULERS, *Mattheüs*, says: "It is evident from Mark and Luke that the healing took place at the moment of contact, and that is how we must interpret Matthew, too."

² STRAUSS, *Leben Jesu*, II, p. 98 f. . . . TENHAEFF, *Magnetiseurs*, says that this case has made people think of "a psycho-physical emanation" (p. 20).

³ STRAUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 99 f.

a kind of *mana* GRUNDMANN has rightly called the concept "force" a constitutive element in the concept of God. The power of God belongs to the Essence of God. Christ the Son possesses power as the Plenipotentiary of the Father, Mt. 28 : 18: He works in the power of the Lord, as Luke in particular points out.¹ "Luke therefore delineates Christ as a vessel of power endowed with an essence of power, who reveals his power wherever he comes."² We have already stated our objections to the words "essence of power," since they have too material a ring. But we agree with GRUNDMANN's train of thought about the Power of God being part of His essence, in which power Jesus shares as the Plenipotentiary of the Father. This argument cuts short and rejects the views that Jesus was a mesmerist or a vessel of occult, spiritual forces.

(b) A second question is the following: did the touching by the woman mean a loss of power for Jesus? CLEMEN believes that this was not so,³ whereas GRUNDMANN envisages a reduction of power at the moment of healing.⁴ However, the latter view brings us dangerously close to Strauss' "battery!" We must then ask ourselves what idea we are to form of the "discharge" in mass healings.

¹ Lk. 1 : 35; 4 : 14, 36; 5 : 17; 6 : 19.

² GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 63. Cf. GRUNDMANN, *TWNT*, II, p. 302. *Dunamis* is an expression for the: "die Heilung schaffende Kraftsubstanz. So ist also Jesus für Lk der Kraftträger schlechthin." DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*, thinks that the Evangelist pictured Jesus' miraculous power: "als physisch-hyperphysisches Vermögen, das den Leib erfüllte und von ihm geheimnisvoll ausstrahlte." GUARDINI, *De Heer*, says: "It seems as if He is charged with a healing force" (p. 85). LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle*, p. 465: "En un mot, telle est la persuasion de l'Église que l'humanité de Jésus-Christ est réellement l'instrument physique de la Divinité, que le Concile d'Éphèse n'hésite pas à appeler sa chair, une chair vivifiante; et ceci justement à cause de son union avec le Verbe." BIELER, *op. cit.*, p. 81, says of Mk. 5 : 25 ff.: "Um die Stelle haben sich zahlreiche Erklärer bemüht; man wird festhalten dürfen, dass δύναμις hier die 'Kraft' ist, deren Begriff und Wesen die neuere Religionswissenschaft in so hohem Masse beschäftigt; man kann δύναμις geradezu mit *mana* übersetzen, was einige melanesische Bibelübersetzungen tatsächlich getan haben." Cf. Lk. 24 : 49, the disciples become "Manaträger."

³ CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 95: "Denn auch wenn Jesus Mk. 5, 30, Lk. 8, 46 bei Berührung durch das blutflüssige Weib von sich eine Kraft ausgehen fühlt, so ist dabei nicht notwendig an einen *Kraftverlust* für ihn zu denken."

⁴ GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 61. Grundmann remarks with reference to Lk. 6 : 19 and 8 : 46: "Es dürfte nicht zweifelhaft sein, dass hinter diesen Formulierungen die Vorstellung einer Kraftsubstanz liegt, mit der Jesus angefüllt gedacht ist, und die sich im Augenblick einer Heilung vermindert." HAUCK, *Markus*, speaks of a subjective feeling of loss of power by Jesus.

(c) The third question relates to Jesus' "knowing." Did Jesus know who had touched Him or not? BORNHÄUSER envisages "knowledge from afar" and "shared knowledge." As a prophet Jesus knew the woman's thoughts before she touched Him.¹ GREYDANUS likewise believes that Jesus knew, but that He summoned the woman for the benefit of her peace of mind.² PLUMMER is more cautious: Jesus knew that He had been touched with a purpose, and probably He knew who had touched Him.³ Others are of the opinion that Jesus did not know. STRAUSS, for instance, argues that those who say that Jesus did know that it was the woman, but acted as if He did not know her, in order to shatter her false modesty, are guided in their exegesis by their "Christian consciousness."⁴ KEULERS makes a distinction between the divine or instilled knowledge of Jesus and His empirical knowledge, in which He was as limited as any other man. With His empirical knowledge Jesus did not know who had touched Him, which is why He could pose the question in all seriousness.⁵ We share this scholar's opinion that Jesus meant the question seriously and that He was in fact unaware who had touched Him. The text is too clear for any other interpretation.

(d) The fourth question, which is closely connected with the second and the third, confronts us with the difficult problem of the "virtue" that "had gone out of him." However, first of all we shall have to consider the woman's act more closely. Like countless of her fellows, she wrongly believed that the vessel's power communicated itself or was transferred to the clothing that he wore, so that thoughts of magic were doubtless involved here.⁶ The fact that she sought contact with Jesus secretly and not openly is attributed among other things to her feelings of shame and modesty,⁷ or to her fear of making Jesus "unclean."⁸

¹ BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 92.

² GREYDANUS, *Lukas*.

³ PLUMMER, *St. Luke*. The "Who touched me?" is not an informative question. There is "no reason for supposing that the miracle was wrought without the will of Jesus."

⁴ STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 99.

⁵ KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*.

⁶ SCHNEIDER, *TWNT*, III, p. 904. Jesus recognizes the faith of the sick woman: "obwohl sich die Anschauungen der Frau einem zauberischen Magismus nähern." Cf. the chapter: *Jesus' Methods of Treatment*.

⁷ HAUCK, *Lukas*: "Scham und Bescheidenheit veranlassen die Heimlichkeit ihrer Tat."

⁸ Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 519 f. Among other references *Zabim* 5, 6:

Who can analyse the mass of motives correctly? At a given moment this woman, who for so long had visited doctor after doctor in vain, grasped Jesus' garment, and at the same moment recovered. Many attribute this healing to "autosuggestion;" the suddenness of her act proved advantageous to her physical condition.¹ But this explanation brings us into conflict with the text. For "virtue" went forth from Jesus, i.e. there is no question of a unilateral event, but of a "mutual" happening. MICKLEM has tried to find a psychological explanation for this mutuality. He calls Jesus "supremely sensitive," and when the woman touched Him in a tense and concentrated state of mind, Jesus doubtless noticed this. Our contemporary experience and observation support this view, says MICKLEM.²

In our search for a solution we shall again closely survey the situation as Mark and Luke portray it. The disciples said, somewhat disrespectfully and impatiently — after all, they were on their way to a dying child — "Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and

"Wer einen Zab, eine Zaba, eine menstruierende Frau, eine Wöchnerin, einen Aussätzigen, deren Lager u. deren Sitz berührt, verunreinigt zwei Grade (indem das von einem solchen Berührte wiederum verunreinigt) u. macht das im dritten Grade Berührte untauglich (zum Genuss)." HAUCK, Markus; BORNHÄUSER, Das Wirken des Christus, p. 91. KLOSTERMANN, Das Markusevangelium, rejects this view.

¹ KLAUSNER, Jesus of Nazareth, p. 271: "... this was a case of auto-suggestion." MACKINNON, The Historic Jesus, p. 344: "In such cases autosuggestion produces the ardently desired physical effect." WORCESTER-MCCOMB-CORIAT, Religion and Medicine, p. 344, refer to the words from the Talmud: "Let thine issue of blood be stopped—an ancient example of the modern theory of autosuggestion." EBSTEIN, Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud, p. 97: "Ob hierbei nervöse bez. sogenannte suggestive Einflüsse mitgewirkt haben, darüber wird, wie hier die Sachen liegen, nicht wohl diskutiert werden dürfen." SENG, Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung, p. 18, classifies the case among the: "psychischen mit körperlichen Symptomen." Nor may the touching be neglected: "Es handelt sich da um Empfindungen, wie sie von den sogenannten Heilmagnetopathen und deren Patienten ganz übereinstimmend geschildert werden. Leider wissen wir über diese Dinge objektiv so gut wie nichts." MICKLEM, Miracles and the New Psychology, p. 122, points to the influence of hypnosis on menstruation. VON AMMON, Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu, I, p. 416, thinks of shock healing. PREUSS, op. cit.: "Dass die Therapie rein psychischer Natur war (von der Heilskraft Jesu war schon die Kunde verbreitet) ist bei allen Erklärern zweifellos, die Mesmeristen haben die Worte Jesu: 'ich habe Kraft von mir ausgehen gefühlt,' natürlich in ihrem Sinne gedeutet" (p. 439). WEATHERHEAD, Psychology, Religion and Healing, p. 56: "The case before us illustrates the mechanism of suggestion more than it illustrates any great religious experience. The disease is thought to have been menorrhagia or painful menstruation." The woman had "expectancy, but not 'faith' in any developed Christian sense at all." Cf. p. 428: The woman had nothing "worth calling 'faith'."

² MICKLEM, op. cit., p. 121.

sayest thou, Who touched me,?" Mk. 5 : 31. According to Luke Jesus' question even caused a certain stir among the multitude, for "all denied," and Peter said: "Master, the multitude throng thee and press thee," Lk. 8 : 45. It may be derived from this that the woman definitely was not the only one who came into contact with Jesus; the "all denied," after all, gives reason to suspect the opposite! It is not known whether there were other sick persons among the multitude who deliberately touched Jesus, but it may be deduced from the situation that "virtue" did not go out of Jesus upon every contact. It is important to note this, since it means that Jesus' power was as it were aroused and directed by and directed itself towards the person who did in fact expect salvation from Him. According to Mk. 5 : 30 Jesus immediately knew "in himself that virtue had gone out of him," whilst Lk. 8 : 46 states: "I perceive that virtue is gone out of me." Various translations and interpretations which speak of Jesus "noting," "feeling," "becoming aware of," being "conscious" or "sensing" that virtue had gone out of Him do not correctly reproduce the meaning of the word; they give the verb too passive an accent.¹

There is no question of a kind of automatic flow or involuntary discharge of power; nothing happened *to* Jesus, but something happened *in* Him; the power did not go out of Jesus beyond His control, as GOULD thinks.²

After this analysis of the situation, we arrive at the following explanation. We may compare this healing with the mass healings which Jesus performed. Then, too, it was unknown persons who touched Him, and "as many as touched were made perfectly whole."³

¹ THE verb γι(γ)νώσκω contains the idea of "knowing" more strongly than the verb αἰσθάνομαι (to observe). γιγνώσκω means "to know," "to understand," "to be aware of." Cf. DELLING, TWNT, I, p. 186 ff., (αἰσθάνομαι); BULTMANN, TWNT, I, p. 688 ff., γιγνώσκω.

² GOULD, St. Mark. The healing occurred: "not by the conscious exercise of power by Jesus, but by power that went out from him involuntarily, and of which he became conscious only afterwards." We again have here the idea of an automatic discharge. PLUMMER, St. Luke, says on the other hand: "There is no reason for supposing that the miracle was wrought without the will of Jesus." KEULERS, Marcus en Lucas: "We must not interpret this as if Jesus, in a manner perceptible by the senses, had felt virtue go forth from him and the miracle had happened beyond his control." CALVIN, Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas, re Mt. 9 : 20: "Certe minime dubium est quin sciens ac volens mulierem sanaverit . . ."

³ Mt. 14 : 36. The sick beseech Him: "that they might only touch the hem of his garment" (!). Cf. Mk. 6 : 56. Mk. 3 : 10 also speaks of sick people who 'press' upon Jesus to try and touch him. Lk. 6 : 19: "And the whole multitude sought

Doubtless in these cases, where people "pressed" Him, many tried to touch Him anywhere they could, so that Jesus could not see all of them personally. But He consciously gave healing to these sick persons who sought their salvation from Him, for the very reason that they sought it from Him. And so He also bestowed healing upon the unknown woman who touched the border of His garment and who sought salvation from Him, because she expected it of Him; as He did so, He "perceived" the virtue that went out of Him. However, Jesus considered it necessary that this woman should not withdraw into the anonymous mass; He wanted to get to know her so that He, who was on His way to a dying child, not only could make of her a "witness" for the people of the power of the Kingdom of God, but also, and in particular, could as it were confirm her healing. Any idea of magic had to be banished and both the woman and the people had to have it brought home to them that "faith" had made her whole.

CALVIN believes that Jesus had drawn the woman to Him through His mind to heal her, but asked after her: "to make her appear of her own volition."¹ According to GREYDANUS Jesus' question as to who had touched Him alluded to a "special contact," and the healed woman had to know that Jesus had noted this special element.²

Mark continues his account by stating that Jesus "looked round about" to see who had done this, whereupon the woman fell down before Him, "fearing and trembling," and told Him "all the truth," Mk. 5 : 32 ff. The woman's fear has been ascribed to all kinds of motives: to feelings of guilt, since she had committed an offence against the law; to shame, since she had to make her complaint known in public; to reverence, because she had recognized Jesus' power and majesty; to the thought that Jesus might be angry at her and undo the healing. There is more to be said for the one theory than for the other, but who can know the truth? Luke adds that the woman declared "before all the people" why she had touched Jesus, Lk. 8 : 47.³

to touch him: for there went virtue out of him, and healed them all" . . . Against this background a clearer light falls on the woman's behaviour. Why should she not do in the press of the multitude what so many had done before her?

¹ CALVIN, *op. cit.*, re Mt. 9 : 20: "... imo dubium non est quin suo eam Spiritu ad se traxerit ut sanitatem referret: sed eam requirit ut sponte in medium prodeat." For the woman, in her thoughtless fervour, had "gone a little astray" (*forte zelo inconsiderato paululum a via deflexit*). ² GREYDANUS, *Lukas*.

³ PETERSON, *op. cit.*, p. 191, points to the people as witnesses of the miracle

After the woman had told her story, Jesus eased her mind with the words: "Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague," Mk. 5 : 34. The words "and be whole of thy plague" are absent from Luke 8 : 48. Jesus did not give the woman any further instruction; He did not correct her, or rather His summons and His words formed as such the correction, whilst He saw and brought to the fore the essential aspect of her story and attitude, viz. her faith.¹

KAFKA characterizes the healing of the woman as a mystery. He sees the miraculum as mediated by the miracle-worker and the mystery "as an immediate command of God to matter."² The miracle "happened" to the woman without its being "worked." The objection to this view is that Jesus is made into a passive intermediary.³

Tradition has not left the unknown woman anonymous; legend later adorned her with the name Berenice, Veronica.⁴ In EUSEBIUS we find the story that the woman was from Caesarea Philippi (Paneas) and that by the door of her home in that town there stands on a high stone a copper statue of a female figure, "kneeling and with her hands stretched before her," entreating a male figure said to resemble Jesus. At the feet of this figure a "strange sort of herb" is said to grow on the column possessing medicinal powers against all kinds of diseases.⁵

and acclaimers. "Nach Luk 8, 46 ff. wird das geheilte blutflüssige Weib von Jesus aufgefordert, das Wunder zu erzählen. Auch hier soll also das Volk Zeuge sein."

¹ PLUMMER, St. Luke, rightly comments: "It was the grasp of her faith, not of her hand, that wrought the cure. Thus her low view of the manner of Christ's healing is corrected." Cf. GREYDANUS, Lukas; VAN LEEUWEN, Markus. BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, Markus, says: "the touch is the encounter of two elements, viz. faith and Jesus." The two elements made the touch into something special. FENNER, Die Krankheit im N.T., p. 94: in the woman's faith her inner disposition towards healing seems to be given. "Jesu Wunder waren nicht etwas automatisch Funktionierendes, sondern durch den ihnen entgegenkommenden Glauben bedingt." See also FOERSTER, TWNT, VII, p. 990.

² KAFKA, Naturgesetz, Freiheit u. Wunder, p. 115 f.: "Wir verstehen also das Wunder als einen durch den Wundertäter vermittelten, das Mysterium als einen unmittelbaren Befehl Gottes an die Materie, ohne freilich zu verstehen, wie die Materie diesen Befehl zu vernehmen vermag."

³ KEULERS, Marcus en Lucas, rightly considers the view that God healed the woman directly, beyond Jesus' control, to be in conflict with the way in which all the other miracles happened.

⁴ Acta Pilati, cap. 2. . . Pseudo-Ambrosius identified the woman with Martha, Lazarus' sister (see PLUMMER, St. Luke).

⁵ EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., VII, XVIII, 1-4. . . VON HARNACK, Medizinisches

aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte, p. 142 (106), thinks that this was a statue of Aesculapius. "War es nun eine Äskulapstatue—und dafür spricht die heilkräftige Pflanze—so läge hier allerdings ein Übergang von 'Äskulap-Soter' zu 'Jesus-Soter' vor." Cf. VON HARNACK, *Mission u. Ausbreitung*, I, p. 131. It is probable: "dass es, vielleicht schon frühe, von der christlichen Bevölkerung in Paneas umgedeutet worden ist." See also KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 291 ff. FRANCES says in a note in his translation of Eusebius that the statue, according to Von Dobschütz, *Christusbilder*, 1899, was a pagan votive monument, but that it is told on the other hand that Julian the Apostate had the likeness of the man replaced by his own image and thus was convinced that it was a statue of Christ.

VII. THE HEALING OF THE WOMAN BOWED TOGETHER

The account of the healing of the woman who could not lift herself up for eighteen years is given only in Luke 13 : 10-17.¹ The Evangelist gives only sketchy information on time and place: the healing took place on a Sabbath in a synagogue. In the synagogue there was a woman² "which had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together," so that she could "in no wise" lift herself up. The reading that she could "not entirely" or "not altogether" lift herself up is, as BROUWER, KEULERS, and others say, preferable to the translation that she could "in no wise" lift herself up.³

The sick woman was tormented by a "spirit of infirmity," i.e. by a spirit which caused the weakness. Her illness was therefore ascribed to a supernatural evil force, viz. the force of Satan, cf. verse 16.⁴

This spirit had paralysed her physically and mentally. Although they are insufficiently defined, the symptoms bring hysteria to mind. EBSTEIN states that in violent hysterical conditions the contraction of groups of muscles can be observed. Though rather long, the period of eighteen years is still possible, EBSTEIN thinks. The "spirit of infirmity" may be interpreted as "attendant mental symptoms. . .

¹ BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 10, classifies the account among the apophthegms, Streit- und Schulgespräche.

² VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, III, p. 10, thinks that this woman was sitting by the synagogue as a beggar.

³ Lk. 13 : 11, καὶ μὴ δυναμένη ἀνακύψαι εἰς τὸ παντελές. The Greek sentence-construction allows of either translation. Literally it reads: "and not having the power to lift herself up altogether."

⁴ Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1, p. 521 ff., on the activity of demons as producers of disease. STÄHLIN, TWNT, I, p. 491. GREYDANUS, Lukas, rightly points out that obviously possession is not meant here. KEULERS, Marcus en Lucas: "There is no question of genuine possession, but the disease *was* caused by an evil spirit, as Jesus says in verse 16." SMIT, *De Daemoniacis*, p. 162 f., says that this is a case of *circumsessio daemoniaca*, but not of *possessio*. FOERSTER, TWNT, VII, p. 159: "Es kann auch eine Krankheit, die nicht die Zeichen der Besessenheit trägt, als von Satan verursacht angesprochen werden (Lk 13, 16)." CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Lk. 13 : 11, thinks that it was probably no ordinary disease that physicians could deal with, hence the use of "spirit of infirmity." For the devil often afflicts people with unusual ills. (Quia speciem morbi aliter non designat, verisimile est non vulgarem fuisse, vel cuius ratio medicis constaret: ideo vocat infirmitatis spiritum. Scimus enim diaboli opera ut plurimum insolitis malis, et non naturalibus affligi homines.)

which as a rule accompany such highly hysterical conditions and which, like the convulsions or the paralysis, can be healed.”¹

MICKLEM does not believe that a diagnosis is possible, but compares this story with a similar case, that of a young sailor, nineteen years of age, who, hypnotized by Janet, recovered immediately.²

According to FENNER the woman was bent forward, and probably suffered from scoliosis hysterica, hysterical curvature of the spine.³

VON AMMON believes that we are concerned here with a contracture of the second cervical vertebra, which had become chronic through mental causes. As a result of Jesus laying His hands upon her, “the pressure on the nerves” disappeared.⁴ With this view he does not follow in the footsteps of his rationalistic predecessor, PAULUS, who believes that there is no reason to think of contracture or possibly tetanus. The woman was suffering from hysteria or melancholia, and she had not been bowed for the full eighteen years, but “*was* bent, bowed,” i.e. she was now, and had been for some time.⁵

There is thus considerable difference of opinion, which is due to the scanty data, but it seems to us that the text is not strained if we stress the mental impotence of the woman.

When Jesus saw her — Jesus thus took the initiative — He said to her: “Woman, thou art loosed from thine infirmity.”⁶ With these words Jesus thus establishes the healing, the liberation from the pa-

¹ EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*, p. 74. Cf. MEAD, *Medica Sacra*, p. 87 f.

² MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 125. “The case of the young sailor is reported by P. Janet, *l’Automatisme psychologique*, 8me édition, p. 361. This patient was: “atteint d’hystéro-épilepsie et anesthétique de presque tout le corps.” WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 60: “The fact that she was ‘immediately made straight’ (v. 13) suggests a hysterical paraplegia rather than an osteitis, as Hastings’ ‘Dictionary’ suggests (Vol. III, p. 328), and the idea of a spirit of infirmity suggests a nervous origin. Luke, the doctor, is fond of ascribing disease to demons.”

³ FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 54 f. TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.*, p. 36, likewise envisages severe hysteria. According to MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 343, it was “evidently a case of paralysis.”

⁴ VON AMMON, *op. cit.*, III, p. 9 ff.: “Wer jemals solche Beschwerden des zweiten oder vorletzten Halswirbels empfunden hat, weiss es aus eigener Erfahrung, mit welcher dankbaren Freude er den Wiedergebrauch dieses Gliedes begrüßte.” However, the description “bent, bowed” invalidates this view of so limited a disorder. Lagrange, too, thinks that we must conceive of the woman being incapable of lifting her head; see KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*. SMIT, *op. cit.*, p. 163, envisages a physical complaint, viz. arthritis deformans.

⁵ PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, II, p. 201 ff.

⁶ γύναι, ἀπολέλυσαι τῆς ἀσθενείας σου. It sounds like a command: the hostile disorder is defeated!

ralysing force, as a fait accompli: from this moment on you are liberated from it! After He had laid His hands on her, the sick woman at once straightened up and glorified God.¹

WOOLSTON denies this healing its miraculous nature; it was "no miracle at all."²

The ruler of the synagogue resented Jesus' performing this healing, since it had happened on a Sabbath, and the discussion between Jesus and the Jewish leaders, as so often happened, stressed the fundamental difference between Jesus' view of the right way to observe the Sabbath and that of the Jews.³ Jesus drew His opponents' attention to the need to help animals on the Sabbath: they are loosed and watered;⁴ should not a human being, in this case a woman and, what is more, a "daughter of Abraham,"⁵ therefore be released from a bond with which Satan had bound her for eighteen years?⁶ Nothing is said about a special sin being the cause of this lengthy suffering. The account ends with the recording of a defeat for Jesus' adversaries, who all were "ashamed," whilst the whole multitude rejoiced at the glorious things that were done by Jesus.⁷

¹ For the chirothesia see the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment. VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *Parapsychologie en Godsdienstig leven*, asks: was this laying-on of hands our modern mesmerism? (p. 60). That is precisely what it was not!

² WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, Second Discourse, p. (47).

³ EITREM, *Demonology*, p. 32: "It is just possible that the controversy of the Sabbath made it desirable to Lk to intensify the character of the sickness which otherwise might have been ascribed to the influence of a demon, as common people were apt to believe."

⁴ STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 199 f., states various regulations regarding the driving of cattle on the Sabbath; the watering of animals and the tying and loosening of knots.

⁵ Cf. Lk. 19 : 9: "son of Abraham." See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 200. Raba, d. 352, called the community of Israel "the daughter of Abraham," Sukka 49b.

⁶ See DEISSMANN, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 258: "Es ist [aber] eine durch das gesamte Altertum gehende Vorstellung, dass ein Mensch durch dämonische Einflüsse gebunden oder gefesselt werden kann." ELIADE, *Images et Symboles*, p. 149, remarks in a discussion of Yahweh as "maitre des liens" that the Jewish Christians also knew: "que c'est le démon qui 'lie' les malades (par ex. Luc 13, 16) . . . Nous rencontrons ainsi, chez le même peuple, une multivalence magico-religieuse des 'liens': liens de la mort, de la maladie, de la sorcellerie—et aussi liens du Dieu."

⁷ In: καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἔχαιρεν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐνδόξοις, ἐνδοξος (KITTEL, TWNT, II, p. 257) is stressed by the opponents' reaction: they were ashamed. See BULTMANN, TWNT, I, p. 190: as in 1 Pe. 3 : 16, κατασχυνθῆναι in Lk. 13 : 17 has the meaning of: "in eine Lage gebracht werden, in der man sich schämen muss."

VIII. THE HEALING OF THE DEAF MAN WITH A SPEECH DEFECT

The healing of the deaf man with "an impediment in his speech" is recounted only in Mk. 7 : 31-37, where the account is placed immediately after the healing of the daughter of the Syro-Phoenician woman.¹ "And again, departing from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, he came unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis," verse 31. According to BULTMANN, this verse forms the "editorial conclusion" to the preceding part: KLOSTERMANN regards it as the "editorial introduction" to the following one. The latter seems more likely.²

KEULERS believes that Jesus made a wide detour round the country of the Jews, "not only to evade the power of Herod, but also to seek rest (cf. Mk. 6 : 31)."³ The route is vaguely indicated and cannot be retraced now. According to DALMAN one cannot speak of a journey "through the centre of the region of Decapolis." The healing probably took place somewhere on the shores of the Sea of Galilee.⁴ We are therefore in the dark about both the time and the

¹ BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 227, classifies the account among the "Wundergeschichten." Matthew has made the story a "Sammelbericht" of all kinds of healings, see Mt. 15 : 29-31. According to DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 68, this is a "Novelle" . . . HELD, *Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch.* (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 195 ff.), is of the opinion that Matthew most probably knew both Mk. 7 : 31-37 and the miracle recounted in Mk. 8 : 22-26, but that he did not include these two accounts because they contain neither the theme of Christology nor that of faith nor that of the disciples. For Held is of the opinion that Matthew was guided by these three themes: "zur Unterweisung seiner Kirche" in his new account of the miracle stories (p. 199).

² BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 227. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*. Cf. KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*.

³ KEULERS, *Mattheüs*, re Mt. 15 : 29.

⁴ DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 214, recalls a journey made on behalf of his Institute in 1907, in which only the northern area of Decapolis was traversed. "Von einem Wandern 'mitten durch das Gebiet der Dekapolis' ist nicht die Rede. Der Ausdruck des Markus erscheint also als geographisch nicht orientiert, und wird nicht allzuernst genommen werden dürfen. Die Heilung des Tauben (Markus 7, 32 ff.) ist dann vom Evangelisten in keiner Weise an die Mitte der Dekapolis geknüpft. Sie ist mit der Wunderspeisung nach 8, 10 vielmehr an das Seeufer gesetzt, wie es Matthäus 15, 29 ff., mit den Heilungen und der Speisung noch deutlicher geschieht." SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, II, pp. 115-148, gives a detailed description of Decapolis, which is mentioned not only in Mk. 7 : 31 but also in Mk. 5 : 20 and Mt. 4 : 25. Pliny, *Hist. nat.*, V, 18, 74,

place of healing. The same applies to the origin of the sick man. Was he Jew or pagan? Either possibility may be preferred. If it is assumed that the man was a Jew, this healing can be contrasted with that of the daughter of the Syro-Phoenician woman, Mk. 7 : 24-30, and the man may be regarded as the representative of the people of Israel in a semi-pagan country, whose ears were opened to salvation. If it is assumed that the man was a pagan, this healing can be set against that of the daughter of the Syro-Phoenician woman and the man regarded as characteristic of the pagan world, which will presently share salvation. However, this is more of an exploration of the text on the basis of theological speculation than a historical approach.

The account proper begins with the statement that "they" — presumably friends of the man — brought "one that was deaf, and had an impediment in his speech" to Jesus and begged Him to lay His hands upon him. The complaint is designated in accordance with the symptoms: the man was deaf and had a speech defect. Various opinions have been stated about the latter symptom, as emerges from the divergent translations. Some believe that this was a case of deaf-dumbness; others are of the opinion that the man could speak a little, even though he did so with difficulty and much stammering.¹ If we have here a case of surdomutitas, deaf-mutism, as it occurs with someone born deaf and dumb, this means that the unfortunate man had not learned to speak and had no idea of language. But if he had become deaf in later life as the result of disease or injury, he would have learned to speak. In that case he would not have uttered only sounds but, because he had not lost the power of speech, he would still have been able to speak "with difficulty." If it is presumed that we are concerned here with a case of hysterical deafness, we might envisage hysterical stuttering, as FENNER does.² There are indications

lists ten towns, viz. Damascus, Philadelphia, Raphana, Scythopolis, Gadara, Hippos, Dion, Pella, Galasa = (Gerasa), Canatha. The number varied: Ptolemeus lists 18 towns. According to Schürer the organization of Decapolis probably goes back to Pompey. They are the Hellenistic towns of Perea (except Scythopolis), once subjugated by Alexander Jannaeus, and later liberated again by Pompey from Jewish domination. They probably formed a league of towns. DALMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 6, states that the league of ten towns is nowhere mentioned in Jewish literature, and "jede Nachricht fehlt" on its organization.

¹ The word *μογιᾶλος* used by Mark can mean both "speaking with difficulty" and "dumb." See BAUER, *Griech.-deu. Wörterbuch* and BLASS-DEBRUNNER, *Neutest. Gramm.*, § 34, 6 and § 119, 5. . . . Both forms appear in the translations.

² FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 72 . . . Fenner puts forward the possi-

in the text which support the view that the man was not dumb, but "poor of speech." When he had fully recovered the power of speech, he spoke well, as verse 35 expressly states and as is quite evident from verse 37. His normal speech formed a surprising contrast to his former abnormal speech.¹

Those accompanying the deaf man requested Jesus to "put his hand upon him." For Jesus had often healed sick persons by means of touch and the laying on of hands.² Without saying a word to them, without any questions about the person of the deaf man, Jesus complied with their request. Instead of a simple touch, as they had requested, He treated the man with a group of actions. "And he took him aside from the multitude, and put his fingers into his ears, and he spit, and he touched his tongue; and looking up to heaven, he sighed, and saith unto him, Ephphatha, that is, Be opened," verses 33, 34. The various actions: the taking aside, spitting, touching, looking up to heaven and sighing, ephphatha, have already been dealt with elsewhere.³

bility that this was a case of aphasia, of inarticulate speech, or rather hysterical stuttering due to contraction of the vocal cords. WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 70, re Mk. 7 : 32-37: "Deafness and speech difficulties are often hysterical, and obviously deafness and mutism are closely associated; hearing often returning when speech is returned . . . All psychiatrists with experience of men in the Forces have had cases of hysterical deafness and aphonia, often occurring simultaneously in the same patient." Cf. MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 116.

¹ TURNER, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*) defends the view that the man was "dumb" as follows: "The word is extraordinarily rare, though found twice in the LXX: but since in Is 35. 5, 6 it occurs with the 'blind,' the 'deaf,' and the 'lame,' and in a papyrus of century 2 A.D. (see Moulton and Milligan's *Vocabulary S.V.*) with the 'deaf' and the 'toothless,' since further it is represented in 37 by the 'speechless,' the conclusion seems clear that it is only a late Greek equivalent to 'dumb'." . . . TRENCH, *Notes on the Miracles*, p. 349 f., thinks that the man: "if he was not altogether dumb, was yet probably incapable of making any articulate sounds" . . . "He was βραδύγλωσσος, ἀγκυλόγλωσσος, balbutiens—that is, he could make no intelligible sounds; but was not absolutely dumb." BAUER, *op. cit.*: "mit Mühe redend—diese Bedeutung könnte für Mk. 7, 32 nahegelegt sein durch V. 35 ἐλάλει ὀρθῶς." KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*. *Mogis* = with effort; the man speaks with difficulty. Many exegetes think "wrongly of a man born deaf and dumb." If the man had always been deaf and dumb: "Jesus would at the same time have to have given him in miraculous fashion a knowledge of Aramaic" . . . As regards the "deafness" of the sick man, see the chapter: *The Healing of the Possessed*.

² See the chapter: *Jesus' Methods of Treatment*.

³ See the chapters: *Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels* and *Jesus' Methods of Treatment*. TURNER, *op. cit.*, remarks with reference to verses 33 and 34: "Note how in the later miracles described by St. Mark (cf. especially

Those who regard Jesus as typical of the ancient miracleworker and exorcist operating with primitive means are fond of referring both to this account and to Mk. 8: 22-26, the healing of the blind man at Bethsaida. On various occasions we have endeavoured to refute this view, and we recall SEVENSTER's pronouncement that all of this relates only to the form of Jesus' action.¹

Needless to say, we must abandon any idea of a kind of "medical" treatment of the patient. BERKELBACH VAN DER SPENKEL makes the significant comment that Jesus had to try to establish contact with a man who was "completely passive" and inaccessible by means of gestures and by acting like a "miracle doctor."² All these actions and gestures must be regarded as important preparations for and approaches to the decisive moment, viz. the speaking of the redeeming word: Ephphatha, Be opened!³ It has rightly been commented

8, 23-25) there is what we may almost call reluctance and even difficulty on the part of our Lord. Certain is that, as the Ministry draws to its close, miracles become less and less an outstanding feature of His work . . . Therefore these later miracles tend to be done as far as possible privately (cf. 36; 8. 23, 26) and almost with effort." For our view see the chapter: Jesus' Miraculous Power.

¹ SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, p. 37. Sevenster discusses Mk. 7 : 33, 8 : 23 and similar texts and then says: "Apparently this only reproduces what was simply the custom in healing in those days. The action of one who heals can in those days only be envisaged in these forms of touching of parts of the body, laying on hands, etc. However, we must realize that all this relates solely to the form of the action."

² BERKELBACH VAN DER SPENKEL, *Markus*. "He stretches open his ears, he makes it clear to him that he wishes to make his tongue alive with his own life, with his 'force', he prays with and for the silent man, he sighs and breathes upon him, he 'inspires' him through all his gestures before he opens him." TRENCH, *op. cit.*, p. 352: "The fingers are put into the ears as to bore them, to pierce through the obstacles which hindered sounds from reaching them. This was the fountain-head: he did not speak plainly, because he did not hear: this defect, therefore, is mentioned as being first removed." HAUCK, *Markus*, sees in the use of spittle: "eine wichtige Beeinflussung seiner Gedanken." Jesus' looking up to heaven shows the sick man that aid must come from God. VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*. The participle πύσας must probably be taken to mean not a spitting on the ground but a moistening with the fingers, with which Jesus then touches the man's tongue." Sighing is "the expression of a strong emotion." KEULERS, *op. cit.*, interprets the sighing as a "silent prayer." Cf. SCHNEIDER, *TWNT*, VII, p. 603. According to SEVENSTER, *op. cit.*, p. 34, Jesus' looking up with a prayer and a sigh stresses the fact "that Jesus can perform his work only in communion with the Father; the surprising signs of the Kingdom of God become possible because God's plenipotentiary acts entirely in obedience to Him." WEATHERHEAD, *op. cit.*, p. 69: "The sighing may have been *felt* as breath on the patient's cheek. Note how Jesus, unable to reach the man through the sound of words, uses the man's other senses to 'get through' to him."

³ ἐφφαθά, ὃ ἐστὶν διανοίχθητι; Ephphatha, quod est adaperire. MANSON,

that Jesus did not address the command to the defective auditory organs, but that He spoke to "the whole man."¹ At that same moment the healing came about: the man's ears were opened, and at once: "the string of his tongue was loosed, and he spake plain." We share KLOSTERMANN's view that demoniac influences need not be envisaged here, any more than in Mk. 8 : 22 ff.²

As in a number of other cases, Jesus did not wish the healing to be disclosed. However, His repeatedly issued command was to no avail; "but the more he charged them, so much the more a great deal they published it," verse 36. This text gives rise to the surmise that Jesus remained in the vicinity for some further time. Were other sick persons perhaps brought to Him?

The reaction of the inhabitants of the semi-pagan border region of Palestine on this occasion was quite different from that after the healing of the Gadarene demoniac, see Mk. 5 : 17. It is also remarkable that Jesus had sent away the healed demoniac with instructions to tell his friends of the great things that the Lord had done for him, Mk. 5 : 19, whilst He now forbade any disclosure.³

The Teaching of Jesus, p. 49, comments: "Where the actual words of Jesus have been recorded as spoken to simple unlearned people, they are Aramaic," with reference to Mk. 5 : 41 and 7 : 34. Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*. BAUER, Griech.-deu. Wörterbuch. ἐφφαθά: "ist Kontraktion d. Form d. Ethpeel (ܐܦܬܐܬܐ)." "

¹ KLOSTERMANN, op. cit., Cf STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 17: "ἐφφαθά = ܐܦܬܐܬܐ oder ܐܦܬܐܬܐ ist als Anrede an das Individuum (nicht an die erkrankten Organe) gemeint im Sinne von 'sei geöffnet!'" The verb is used on several occasions by the rabbis, also for the "opening" of blind eyes . . . Strack-Billerbeck correctly comments that the healing did not take place: "auf dem Wege einer Besprechung, sondern durch Jesu Altmachtswort. Wohl aber dürfte dabei vorausgesetzt sein, dass der Kranke um die Sitte der Verwendung des Speichels gewusst habe" (p. 17).

² KLOSTERMANN, op. cit., re Mk. 7 : 32. With regard to verse 35 Klostermann says: "Nach Deissmann Licht vom Osten 258 ff. will Mc 'nicht einfach erzählen, dass ein Stummer redend gemacht,' 'sondern auch, dass eine dämonische Fessel gelöst' worden ist; indessen kann der ursprüngliche technische Ausdruck hier doch abgegriffen gebraucht sein." BERKELBACH VAN DER SPENKEL, *Markus*; WEATHERHEAD, op. cit., p. 69, and BEHM, TWNT, I, p. 720, likewise refer to Deissmann. According to Behm the tongue was: "dämonisch gebunden" . . . As regards the man's speaking normally again, cf. p. 525. ὁρθῶς means straight, upright (Ac. 14 : 10), in the right way. See PREISKER, TWNT, V, p. 450 ff. KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*. "The healing did not consist in the fact that he spoke, but that he spoke without defect (ὁρθῶς)." For the word "straightway," see the chapter: Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels.

³ For the injunction to silence and the "Messianic secret" see the chapter: The Healing of the Possessed.

The account ends with the comment that they were "beyond measure astonished."¹ The words in which they voiced their astonishment: "He hath done all things well: he maketh both the deaf to hear, and the dumb to speak," can best be interpreted as an eulogy spoken by the Jewish inhabitants of Decapolis, unless they are an editorial addition. For we are reminded here of the prophetic words of Isa. 35 : 5, 6: "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing." HORST is of the opinion that the fulfilment of the prophetic words was a factor determining the retention of this story in tradition. The deaf man could see Jesus, but he could not hear His words. "If it is to be otherwise with him, then in the first place his ears must be opened." As such he is an example and a sign for mankind, who can be saved only by hearing Jesus' words.²

To sum up, we may say the following. Somewhere in Decapolis Jesus bestowed healing upon a deaf man with a speech defect. We know nothing more about the man. Nor do we know anything about the cause of his complaint. We regard this healing in the first place as a salutary function of the Kingdom of God: an anonymous deaf man was released from his suffering, greatly to the surprise and joy of the eye-witnesses. The fact that the patient was a deaf man with a

¹ ὑπερπερισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο. The adverb ὑπερπερισσῶς occurs only here and means beyond measure, exceedingly, exceptionally. See BLASS-DEBRUNNER, *Neutest. Gramm.*, § 116, 3. HAUCK, *TWNT*, VI, p. 58 ff. For the "astonishment" of the people, see the chapter: Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels.

² HORST, *TWNT*, V, p. 552: "Für die Erhaltung der Überlieferung von der Heilung des Ohrs des μογιᾶλος Mk 7, 31-37 mit ihren besonderen Zügen ist wohl auch in diesem Fall die Erfüllung eines Schriftworts, nämlich Js 35, 5 f. . . . bestimmend gewesen." The sick man presents: "ein signifikantes Paradigma für den Menschen überhaupt, für den es ohne eine Öffnung des Ohrs durch Jesus ein σωθῆναι nicht geben kann." . . . "Das Ohr des Hörenden ist das für die Verkündigung Jesu und damit für den Glaubensvorgang wichtigste Organ" (p. 551). Cf. SEVENSTER, *op. cit.*, p. 35. Sevenster points to Jesus' miraculous deeds as signs of His Messianic action and recalls Isa. 35 : 5, 6; 29 : 18; 61 : 1. He refers in note 1, p. 35, to Hoskyns and Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, translated into Dutch by J. P. Enklaar, 1932, p. 171 f., where attention is drawn to the fact that the word μογιᾶλος in Mark 7 : 32 only appears in the New Testament at this place, which must be interpreted as a reference to that text in which it is only found in the Septuagint and of which the healing is the fulfilment: Isa. 35 : 3-6. TRENCH, *op. cit.*, p. 354, says that the exclamation: "He hath done all things well" reminds us of the words of Gen. 1 : 31: "upon which we are thus not unsuitably thrown back, for Christ's work is in the truest sense 'a new creation'."

speech defect, and also having regard to the content of the eulogy, verse 37, makes this healing a sign of Jesus' Messianic activity. In the proclamation of the Gospel this story has a significant function: the message of the Kingdom of God can only be truly understood by him whose ears have been "opened" by Jesus.

IX. THE HEALING OF THE CENTURION'S SERVANT AT CAPERNAUM AND OF THE NOBLEMAN'S SON

Mt. 8 : 5-13 and Lk. 7 : 1-10 preserve the account of the healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum.¹ Jn. 4 : 46-54 contains a similar healing to the one described in the above accounts, but concerns the sick son of a nobleman. The similarity between the Synoptic tradition and that of John gave rise at quite an early date to the question whether these might not be two descriptions of the same event. This problem will have to form the first point of our investigation, which we plan to perform as follows:

- (a) The question of the doublet.
- (b) Exegetic comments.
- (c) The disease and the method of treatment.
- (d) The nobleman's faith.
- (e) Summary and conclusions.

(a) *The question of the doublet*

A comparative study of the three stories, besides yielding characteristic similarities, also provides many important discrepancies.

1. Place and time of the encounter. According to the Synoptic tradition Capernaum was the scene of the encounter; according to John it was Cana, where Jesus had "made the water wine." Luke places the account immediately after the Sermon on the Mount, whilst Matthew first recounts the healing of a leper. Nothing more can be said about the time.

2. The persons who approached Jesus. Matthew states that the centurion personally made the request to Jesus; according to Luke he remained in the background. He had the request transmitted to Jesus via "the elders of the Jews," whilst he later sent "friends" who brought Jesus a special message. John states that the nobleman himself came to Jesus.

3. The person of the patient and his disease. Matthew speaks of a

¹ BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 39, classifies the story among the "Apophthegmata." DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 68, regards it as a "Novelle."

"servant" who "lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tormented." Luke refers to a "servant" who was "sick" and "ready to die." According to John the nobleman's son "was at the point of death."

4. The position of the patient. Matthew has nothing to say about the relation between the centurion and his servant. Luke states that the centurion's servant "was dear unto him." The father's love for his son is evident from John 4 : 49: "Sir, come down ere my child die."

5. Jesus' first reaction. According to Matthew Jesus said to the centurion: "I will come and heal him." Luke tells how the elders "besought" Jesus, whereupon He went with them. It may be deduced from Jn. 4 : 48 how Jesus at first evaded the request by exclaiming: "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe."

6. Jesus' second reaction. After the centurion's remark about his unworthiness and his argument about the range of orders Jesus marvelled at the man's faith, Mt. 8 : 8-12.

Luke states that Jesus "was now not far from the house" when He was informed by friends of the centurion of the latter's feeling of unworthiness, etc., whereupon Jesus marvelled at the man's faith, Lk. 7 : 6-9.

John says that Jesus answered the father's entreaty with the words: "Go thy way; thy son liveth," Jn. 4 : 50.

7. The healing. Matthew states that the servant was healed "in the selfsame hour" at which Jesus had said to the centurion: "Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee," Mt. 8 : 13.

In Luke the healing is recorded, but the moment is not stated. John relates that when the nobleman was on his way home, his servants met him and told him that his child lived. The hour of healing proved to coincide with the time when Jesus had said: "Thy son liveth."

8. Consequences of the healing. John states that both the nobleman and his whole household "believed."

This comparative study reveals that there are considerable differences not only between the Synoptic account and that by John, but also between the versions of Matthew and Luke.¹ However, it is clear that Matthew and Luke are recounting the same incident. But many consider the discrepancies between the Synoptic account

¹ For the differences in wording, etc., between Matthew and Luke, see KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*; HAUCK, *Lukas*; MANSON, *The Teaching of Jesus*, p. 30 f.; ALLEN, *St. Matthew*.

and that of John too great for there to be any question of identity. The following are given as immediately apparent points of difference: 1. the scene of action: Capernaum — Cana; 2. the pagan centurion — the Jewish nobleman; 3. the person of the patient: servant — son, and a number of smaller differences.¹ However, as regards both the choice of words and the content, there is in the three texts considerable internal evidence to support the theory that here one and the same event is recounted in three versions.² When PLUMMER asks whether there is any difficulty entailed in assuming that on more than one occasion Jesus performed a healing without being in the presence of the patient, this question, as a general question, can be answered in the negative. But general questions should not be asked; the question must be put to the texts! And the clues which these contain point in our opinion rather clearly to the view that the three accounts are of the same event.³

¹ Mt. 8 : 6, 8, 13 has παῖς, which is usually translated by "servant." Lk. 7 : 2, 3, 10 has δοῦλος, servant, slave; Lk. 7 : 7 has παῖς. Jn. 4 : 46, 47, 50, 53 has υἱός, son. V. 49: τὸ παιδίον μου, my child; v. 51: παῖς, son. According to BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 151, a "son" must also be envisaged in Matthew and Luke; the δοῦλος of Luke is secondary with regard to the παῖς = child, of Matthew . . . It may be asked whether, if the account had occurred only in Matthew, the word παῖς would likewise have been translated by "servant." In any case the translation "child" would then have been just as warranted as that of "servant." BARRETT, *The Gospel according to St. John*, rightly comments: "it is not made clear in Matthew whether παῖς means 'servant' or 'child'." As the translation is usually done nowadays one can in our opinion speak of a harmonization translation.

² For the choice of words see the examples given by BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, and BARRETT, *op. cit.* The similarity between Mt. 8 : 13: "in the selfsame hour" (ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκεῖνῃ) and Jn. 4 : 53: "at the same hour" (ἐκεῖνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ) is indeed most striking.

³ PLUMMER, *St. Luke*. Plummer considers the identification: "not probable: it involves an amount of misinformation or carelessness on one side or the other which would be very startling." Those opposed to identification of the Synoptic account with that by John include UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes*; KEULERS, *Joannes*. "John, who is well informed about the preparation of Jesus' public ministry, wanted without doubt to tell of a new event; and on his authority we may safely assume its historical truth." VAN DEN BUSSCHE, *Het Boek der tekens*, p. 276. BRANDT, *Das ewige Wort*. "Wir werden also gut tun, in diesem 'Königischen' einen Beamten des Herodes zu sehen, der für seinen Sohn bittet (Mt. 8, 5-13 und Par. bittet ein Hauptmann für seinen Burschen)." TRENCH, *Notes on the Miracles*, p. 118 f. Trench sees the difference above all in "the heart and inner kernel of the two narratives." The centurion is an example of strong faith, and the nobleman one of weak faith. Trench refers to the comparison which Augustine, *In Ev. Joh. Tract. 16*, makes between the centurion's faith and that of the nobleman. At the same time he is of the opinion that in Irenaeus' text, *Adv. haereses*, II, 22: "The son of the centurion he healed without being present, with a word,

(b) *Exegetic comments*

1. *The healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum.* Both Matthew and Luke state that the encounter happened upon Jesus' entry into Capernaum. A centurion stationed in this place had a servant who was seriously ill, for whom he invoked Jesus' aid; according to Matthew he did so personally, according to Luke via others. Neither the name nor the origin of this centurion is known. It is possible that he was a Roman, but it is more probable that he was a member of the non-Jewish population of Palestine; in any case he was a pagan, an officer in the service of Herod Antipas.¹ The answer that Jesus gave the centurion can be taken both as an affirmation and as a question. It can be translated as "I will come and heal him" and "Will I come and heal him?." ² KLOSTERMANN, KEULERS and others rightly believe that this is meant as a question.

saying: Go thy way; thy son liveth" (Filium centurionis absens verbo curavit dicens: Vade, filius tuus vivit), the word "centurio" may be "only a slip of the pen, or the memory." See also p. 222. For those in favour of identification see among others BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 151: "Dass in 4, 46-54 das gleiche Traditionsstück, das Mt. 8, 5-13 = Lk 7, 1-10 begegnet, zugrunde liegt, ist deutlich." BARRETT, *op. cit.* "It seems very probable that the synoptic tradition (or a tradition very closely akin to it) lies immediately behind the Johannine narrative . . ." EITREM, *Demonology*, p. 23, note 2. It is "probably" the same story, cf. p. 40. DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 159: "... ein heidnischer Centurio (Matth. 8, 5; Luk. 7, 2), vielleicht derselbe, der Joh. 4, 46 ein 'Königlicher' genannt wird . . ." FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 59: in Jn. 4 : 47 ff. the subject-matter of Mt. 8 : 5 ff. has been freely adapted. WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 75: "Probably three accounts of the same story . . ." SMELIK, *De Weg van het Woord*, p. 105.

¹ The military rank of this officer was ἐκατόναρχος, centurio. He commanded a centuria, the smallest Roman military unit, consisting of 100 men. Cf. LÜBKERS, *Reallexikon*, p. 209: "'Hundertschaft', unterste Einheit der römischen Infanterie, zuerst in der sog. servianischen Heeresordnung, dann bei allen Fusstruppen und auch in der Flottenmannschaft" . . . Some manuscripts have in Mt. 8 : 5 χιλιάρχης, i.e. the leader of a cohort, a Roman unit of 1000 men, one of which was stationed in Jerusalem. See SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, I, p. 458 ff. LEVERTOFF and GOUDGE, *St. Matthew* (in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*). "The centurion was a non-commissioned officer in the service of Herod Antipas. Probably he was a native of Palestine who spoke Aramaic and knew the Jewish prejudice against 'entering in' with a Gentile." According to KEULERS, *Matthäus*, he was "probably a Roman." KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*. "Der Hauptmann ist kein römischer, sondern Offizier des Antipas" . . . It is striking that all the centurions mentioned in the New Testament are referred to favourably, see Mt. 27 : 54; Lk. 23 : 47; Ac. 10 : 22; 22 : 26; 23 : 17, 23, 24; 24 : 23; 27 : 43. PLUMMER, *St. Luke*, remarks: "Roman organization produced, and was maintained by, excellent individuals, who were a blessing to others and themselves."

² Mt. 8 : 7, ἐγὼ ἐλθὼν θεραπεύσω αὐτόν.

The personal pronoun appears at the beginning to emphasize it: "I will come and heal him?" According to KLOSTERMANN Jesus put a question to "parry" the man: I should enter a pagan and thus Levitically unclean house?¹ We shall offer no opinion on whether the intention of the question is fully interpreted in this version; in any case we do not encounter immediate readiness on the part of Jesus.

According to Luke's version it was "the elders of the Jews" who transmitted the centurion's request. The difference in versions between Matthew and Luke is inexplicable; only surmises are possible. Did Luke have special sources at his disposal, or did he himself edit the text handed down by tradition? Why did the centurion not come personally to Jesus? Is the explanation for this "his deep humility," as KEULERS thinks?² But in that case why did Matthew give us a different version? Or must we envisage an "increase" of humility?³ However, we shall never advance beyond guesses and surmises in problems such as this.

The "elders of the Jews," Lk. 7 : 3, does not mean "rulers of the synagogues," but leading persons and representatives of the civil community.⁴ This deputation requested Jesus to "come and

¹ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*. KEULERS, *Mattheüs*. "Jesus is said to have hesitated because a Jew who entered a pagan's house exposed himself to Levitical defilement (John 18, 28). This also forms an excellent explanation of the centurion's insistence (v. 8) and of the fact that Jesus actually does not enter the house. Those whose translation is 'I shall come and heal him' invoke Luke, who seems to know nothing about any hesitation. But Luke also says that the elders beseeched him, which points to hesitation by Jesus." LEVERTOFF and GOUDGE, *op. cit.* "Our Lord's words are probably to be taken interrogatively."

² KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*.

³ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*. "Wenn bei Lc der Hauptmann sogar nicht wagt, Jesu zu nahen, so scheint das zwar eine Steigerung seiner Demut; aber der ursprüngliche Sinn, dass Jesus kein heidnisches Haus betreten soll, ist dabei verloren . . . Die Eigenheiten des Lc können auf eine besondere Überlieferung zurückgehen, er kann aber auch die Quelle (Q?) selbst so redigiert haben, indem er sich von der Jairusgeschichte inspirieren liess und zugleich der vom Hauptmann Cornelius präludierte (Loisy)."

⁴ *πρεσβύτεροι τῶν Ἰουδαίων*. See BORNKAMM, *TWNT*, VI, p. 651 ff.: "Das besondere Problem des Gebrauchs von *πρεσβύτερος* im Judentum und Christentum erwächst aus der Doppelbedeutung des Wortes, das Altersbezeichnung und zugleich Titel für Träger eines Amtes sein kann" (p. 654). Often the two meanings are difficult to distinguish between. The origin of the "elders" (*הַזִּקְנִים*) lies:

"in der ältesten patriarchalischen Sippenverfassung Israels" (p. 655). See Ex. 3 : 16; 4 : 29; 12 : 21; 17 : 5; Nu. 11 : 16, 24; 16 : 25; Jos. 7 : 6; 8 : 10; 24 : 1, etc. The "elders" represented the people, the civil community; some of them were charged with the administration of justice, see Deu. 19 : 11-13; 21 : 1-9; 21 : 18-21; 22 : 13-21; Ezra 10 : 14, etc. As regards the civil significance of the

heal his servant.”¹ They gave force to their request by drawing Jesus’ attention to the centurion’s unusual attitude to the Jewish people: “saying, That he was worthy for whom he should do this: For he loveth our nation, and he hath built us a synagogue.” Involuntarily the question arises whether Jesus had at first in some way displayed hesitation or reserve, since the elders “besought” Him.² They place the person of the centurion in a particularly favourable light by making Jesus aware of the man’s great affection for and active sympathy with the Jewish people. However, it need not be deduced from the statement that the centurion “loveth” the people that he was a god-fearing man or a proselyte.³

He had achieved great merit by having a synagogue built at his own expense and presenting it to the Jewish community in Capernaum. Similar displays of civic spirit and sympathy with religious interests and institutions are on record.⁴

Nowadays it is fairly generally accepted, or at least considered

“elders” in later days, Bornkamm says: “Die ältere kommunale Verfassung der jüd. Ortsgemeinde erhält sich in der Verfassung der Synagoge. Dem Ortsvorstand dort, der in der Regel aus 7 Mitgliedern gebildet wurde, entspricht in den Ortschaften mit gesonderter jüd Kultusgemeinde der Synagogenvorstand. Auch der Titel *πρεσβύτεροι* für die Inhaber der Gemeindeleitung u der synagogalen Disziplinargewalt erhält sich (vgl Lk 7, 3)” (p. 660). Cf. also SCHÜRER, op. cit., II, p. 176 ff. “An Localsynedrien ist auch zu denken, wenn es Matth. 10, 17 = Marc. 13, 9 heisst, dass die Gläubigen werden *εἰς συνέδρια* überantwortet werden; auch die Gerichte, welche Matth. 5, 22 als niedrigere Instanz vor dem Synedrium vorausgesetzt werden, gehören hierher; ebenso die *πρεσβύτεροι* von Kapernaum (Luc. 7, 3)” (II, p. 177) . . . In Lk. 8 : 49; 13 : 14; Ac. 13 : 15; 18 : 8, 17 “rulers of the synagogue,” *ἀρχισυνάγωγοι*, are mentioned.

¹ Luke here uses the verb *διασώζω*, a stronger form of *σώζω*. PLUMMER, St. Luke, interprets it as “to bring safe through.” Cf. Mt. 14 : 36; Ac. 23 : 24; 27 : 43, 44; 28 : 1, 4; 1 Pe. 3 : 20. See also VAN UNNIK, L’Usage de *ΣΩΖΕΙΝ* „sauver” etc. VAN UNNIK, The “Book of Acts”—the Confirmation of the Gospel.

² BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 39: “Es scheint doch, dass auch Lk die Geschichte in einer Form las, in der deutlich war, dass Jesu Bedenken überwunden werden musste; aber da er den Dialog nicht mehr klar verstand, teilte er die Rolle des Überredens den *πρεσβύτεροι* zu, die nun andere Argumente bringen müssen, die Lk für einleuchtender hielt.”

³ KEULERS, Marcus en Lucas. “He was probably a proselyte or a ‘Godfearing’ man, who had demonstrated his reverence for the Jewish religion in that way.” PLUMMER, St. Luke, re “he loveth our nation:” “This would hardly be said of one who was actually a proselyte.” KLOSTERMANN, Das Lukasevangelium, also thinks that he was not a proselyte: “der charakteristische Ausdruck dafür fehlt.”

⁴ KLOSTERMANN, op. cit. Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, I, Das altjüdische Synagogeninstitut, p. 115 ff. “Natürlich war es Privatpersonen, auch Nicht-israeliten unbenommen, sich durch besondere Stiftungen um die Erbauung einer Synagoge u. um ihre innere Ausrüstung verdient zu machen ”(p. 142). See also SCHÜRER, op. cit., II, p. 427 ff.

highly probable, that the present Tell-Hum is identical with the Capernaum of Jesus' day. The ruins of the synagogue, which have been exposed during excavations, are in the opinion of some scholars those of the synagogue which the centurion caused to be built, but according to many other experts the uncovered synagogue must be dated in the second or third century A.D.¹

Luke continues his account by the statement that Jesus went with the elders.

However, when the group, see Lk. 7 : 6, was "now not far" from the centurion's house, a second deputation appeared, this time made up of "friends" of the centurion.² In some way or the other the centurion must have been informed that Jesus was on His way to his house. The friends addressed themselves to Jesus with a new message which related more to the person of the master than to that of his sick servant. The contents of the message are almost exactly the same as what Matthew has the centurion say to Jesus personally, Mt. 8 : 8,9. The text begins in Luke with a courteous "Lord, trouble not thyself."³ Mt. 8 : 8 is almost word for word the same as Lk. 7 : 6: "for I am not worthy that thou shouldest enter under my roof."⁴ The envoys thus transmitted the vox ipsissima of the centurion. Now the question is why the centurion did not consider himself worthy to receive Jesus in his house. Various reasons for this have been put forward. PLUMMER seeks the motive in the fact that Jesus, as a Jew, would be considered ritually unclean if He entered the house of a pagan.⁵ KEULERS links this motive with

¹ καφαρναούμ = כְּפָר נַחֻם, "Nachumsdorf"—see STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 159: the present-day Tell-Hūm, on the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, Jesus' "own city" (Mt. 9 : 1), was one of the most important places where Jesus preached and worked miracles. For the excavations see DALMAN, Orte u. Wege, p. 149 ff. DALMAN's conclusion: "Es wird nach allem berechtigt sein, wenn wir die Synagoge von tell-hūm, deren Wiederaufbau hoffentlich nicht versucht wird, für den Neubau derjenigen halten, in welcher Jesus einen Besessenen heilte (Mark. 1, 21 ff.; Luk. 4, 31 ff.) und den kraftlosen Arm eines anderen zurechtbrachte (Matth. 12, 9 ff.; Mark. 3, 1 ff.; Luk. 6, 6 ff.)" (p. 162 f.). Cf. KOPP, Die heiligen Stätten der Ev., p. 215 ff.

² ἐπεμψεν φίλους ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης. Cf. Ac. 10 : 24, where it is said of Cornelius that he "had called together his kinsmen and near friends."

³ PLUMMER, St. Luke. "Lord, cease to trouble Thyself."

⁴ οὐ γὰρ ἱκανός εἰμι, non sum dignus. See STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 475, and II, p. 217, οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανός = אֲנִי כְּדַאי, I am not enough = I am not worthy.

This expression is in general use among the rabbis. For the construction see BLASS-DEBRUNNER, Neutest. Gramm., § 393, 4.

⁵ PLUMMER, op. cit. The centurion was no proselyte. "The house of a Gentile

the man's psychological state: his "deep humility" and his conviction of "personal unworthiness" induced him not to come personally to Jesus.¹ In our opinion RENGSTORF elevates the text to the right level. In his view the centurion was not so much governed by the idea of ritual uncleanness as by the realization of the majesty and the power of Jesus. For this reason Jesus presently praises him for his "faith."²

The "unworthiness" is accentuated by Luke by the interpolation: "Wherefore neither thought I myself worthy to come unto thee," by which words the centurion wished to justify the first deputation.³ The words in which the request is repeated are about the same in Matthew and Luke. Mt. 8 : 8 has: "but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed;" Lk. 7:7: "but say in a word, and my servant shall be healed." The literal translation is "speak with a word." The centurion thus proved to have unlimited confidence in the power of Jesus' word, irrespective of whether Jesus pronounced this in the presence or the absence of the sick person. By an example taken from his profession he illustrated both the power of the word, the command, and its range. Here too the texts are practically identical.

was polluting to a Jew; and therefore οὐ γὰρ ἱκανός εἰμι, κ.τ.λ., is quite in point if he was still a heathen. But it is rather strong language if he had ceased to be a heathen."

¹ KEULERS, Marcus en Lucas.

² RENGSTORF, TWNT, III, p. 295: "Wenn er im Blick auf Jesus sagt: οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανός ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς (Mt), so bestimmt ihn weniger der Gedanke an die rituelle Verunreinigung, der sich Jesus als Jude durch das Betreten eines nichtjüdischen Hauses aussetzen würde, als die Gewissheit der Hoheit und Vollmacht Jesu, die ihn weit über alles Menschliche und noch dazu Nichtjüdische hinaushebt. Das bringt vor allem die Art zum Ausdruck, wie er dann anschliessend (Mt 8, 9) sich selbst und Jesus dessen ἐξουσία verdeutlicht. So enthält das οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανός im Munde des Hauptmanns sein Bekenntnis zur Messianität Jesu, und als solches nimmt Jesus es an und gewährt ihm, was er da gewährt, wo man ihm 'glaubt': ὑπάγε, ὡς ἐπίστευσας γενηθήτω σοι." Rengstorf compares the attitude of Paul with that of the centurion, see 1 Co. 15 : 9: "For I am the least of the apostles, that am not meet to be called an apostle." Cf. TRENCH Notes on the Miracles, p. 224: "It was not merely that he was a heathen, and so might claim no near approach to the King of Israel; but there was, no doubt, beneath this and mingling with this, a deep and inward feeling of his own personal unworthiness and unsuitness for a close communion with a holy being, which caused him again to send, beseeching the Lord to approach no nearer, but only to speak the word, and he knew that straightway his servant would be healed. And thus, in Augustine's words, 'counting himself unworthy that Christ should enter into his doors, he was counted worthy that Christ should enter into his heart' (Serm. 62, I: Dicendo se indignum praestitit dignum, non in cujus parietes, sed in cujus cor Christus intraret)."

³ This interpolation is missing from various manuscripts.

As the commander of a relatively small force, the centurion was aware that he was "a man under authority, having soldiers under me."¹ He had to obey the orders of his superiors; his soldiers had to follow the orders which he himself gave. Military authority is clearly and concisely characterized in the orders mentioned by the centurion: "Come," "Go," and "Do this." The meaning is obvious. The rumours of Jesus' power in word and deed had reached his ears too, see Lk. 7 : 3. ² Reasoning a *minori ad maius*, the centurion regarded Jesus as a commander of the powers which afflict mankind with disease. At Jesus' command those powers had to "come," "go" and "do this," as is the case in the military world. ³ It may also be wondered whether the centurion meant that Jesus would command "good" powers, angels, to drive out the "evil" powers or that He Himself would expel the disease-producing demon from the servant. ⁴ Not the secondary, but the main issue is of importance. And the main issue lies in these two points of comparison: (a) the absolute power of the word of the man of authority; (b) the conviction that the order will be obeyed, wherever the one commanded may be. ⁵

Both Matthew and Luke state that Jesus "marvelled" when He

¹ Mt. 8 : 9 has ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν, under authority (some manuscripts add τασσόμενος). Lk. 7 : 8 has ὑπὸ ἐξουσίαν τασσόμενος, set under authority. The fact that the centurion calls himself a "man," ἄνθρωπος, causes PLUMMER, op. cit., to remark: "Perhaps ἄνθρωπος hints that Jesus is superhuman." This seems far-fetched to us.

² GODET, Lukas, thinks that the centurion had heard among other things about the healing of the nobleman's son. "The knowledge which he had of this miracle performed in the same town is certainly the most natural means of explaining the faith evidenced by his message." In this way the accounts are smoothed out a little too easily!

³ KLOSTERMANN, Das Matthäusevangelium. "Sehr hübsch stellt sich der Offizier Jesu Macht (μόνον λόγῳ) über die personifizierte Krankheit oder auch den sie verursachenden bösen Geist nach Analogie seiner eigenen Kommandogewalt vor." Cf. BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 180, on Jesus' life as "Lord," as "the royal man" among His fellow-men.

⁴ BORNHÄUSER, Das Wirken des Christus, remarks that the centurion was acquainted with the religious world of ideas of the Jews. "Er weiss, dass die Engel die unsichtbaren Boten Gottes sind, die seine Befehle ausrichten. Sie hat Gott Jesu zur Verfügung gestellt und damit sind ihm Fernwirkungen möglich" (p. 71). KEULERS, Mattheüs, says that the servants who obey Jesus' command are not the disease-producing demons: "these are the diseases themselves, which are personified." JEREMIAS, Babylonisches im N.T., p. 96: "Der Hauptmann stellt sich die Wundertat Jesu nach Analogie einer orientalischen Dämonenvertreibung vor. Die Krankheit ist Wirkung böser Dämonen nach seiner Anschauung. Wie ihm die Soldaten aufs Wort gehorchen, so wird Jesus den Dämonen befehlen können."

⁵ PLUMMER, op. cit. "It is the certainty of the result without personal presence that is the point."

heard the words of the centurion. Some exegetes incorrectly associate the fact that Jesus "marvelled" with the problem of Jesus' "omniscience." However, here we are not in the world of knowledge, but that of the emotions. We are in the atmosphere of strong feelings producing immediate reactions. On this psychological plane Jesus often gives evidence of human passions, of wrath and indignation, of sorrow and amazement, etc.¹

To those who followed Him Jesus said: "I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel," Mt. 8 : 10.² In these words we may perceive both the admiration and the emotion which had seized Jesus. Consequently, attempts should not be made to weaken this pronouncement or apparently to correct it by remarking, as KEULERS does, that "it goes without saying" that Jesus did not rank the pagan's faith above that of His mother and of His pupils.³

We must interpret these words as an exclamation of surprise and joy at the fact that this pagan appeared to see and understand what the children of the people of God did not see.

Various scholars regard the faith of the centurion as "belief in miracles," in fact even as an advanced level of this belief!⁴ We cannot understand how they can reconcile this with the significance of Jesus' exclamation. Would Jesus have been prepared to praise to the multitude an expression of belief in miracles, however forceful it might be, as "so great faith" which He had not even found in Israel?

SEVENSTER has remarked that the faith of the centurion must certainly not be interpreted as receptivity to suggestion. Nor should we think of trust in God in general. "The most evident explanation

¹ PLUMMER, op. cit., asks those who are not prepared to accept the slightest limitation of Jesus' knowledge "to explain how wonder is compatible with omniscience." KEULERS, *Mattheüs*, rightly rejects Augustine's view that Jesus wanted to demonstrate what ought to arouse *our* wonder. Keulers prefers Thomas' view. "Jesus could really marvel because, in accordance with His empirical knowledge (*scientia experimentalis*) He was able to notice something new and unusual." Cf. the section: Jesus' "knowledge."

² Cf. Lk. 7 : 9.

³ KEULERS, *Mattheüs*.

⁴ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*. "πίστιν: Vertrauen auf Jesu Wundermacht wie 9, 2.22.29." PLUMMER, op. cit. "Nowhere among the Jews had He found any one willing to believe that He could heal without being present." KEULERS, *Mattheüs*, p. 113, in a short discussion of "Faith among the Synoptists," makes the following comment: "This faith in Jesus' miraculous power, which we also find in the centurion of Capernaum, is not yet true beatific faith, but it is an excellent preparation for it."

here too is that this faith relates to Jesus' coming in the name of God. Then the comparison of the centurion's faith with that of Israel is understandable. For such a recognition of the coming of Jesus as the bringer of the coming reign of salvation should first of all be expected from Israel. That recognition, of which he finds little if anything in Israel, he now finds in the pagan centurion."¹ In this view — compare also BARTH's opinion that anyone who believes in Jesus Christ is concerned ipso facto, with or without signs, with the Lord of heaven and earth — the centurion's faith is correctly characterized.

We may recall the two essential characteristics which we mentioned earlier: the unconditional recognition of Jesus as the one of authority — which implies belief in the power of miracles — and the conviction, the certainty, that Jesus' word is efficax. This is the faith that is praised by Jesus.²

For Luke the climax is reached with this pronouncement by Jesus. In a few words he adds the successful outcome of the encounter: "And they that were sent, returning to the house, found the servant whole that had been sick," Lk. 7 : 10.

Matthew adds the following to Jesus' words of praise: "And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth," Mt. 8 : 11, 12.

In Lk. 13 : 28, 29 this pronouncement appears in another context and in reverse order: first Jesus speaks of the casting out of the Jews

¹ SEVENSTER, *op. cit.*, p. 36. . . . BARTH, K.D., III, 1, p. 37: "Wer an Jesus Christus glaubt, der hat es mit oder ohne Zeichen ipso facto mit dem Herrn des Himmels und der Erde zu tun: mit dem, der in dem ganzen Bereich der von Gott verschiedenen Wirklichkeit verfügen kann und verborgen oder (im Zeichen) offenkundig immer und überall verfügt. Dass er mit dieser möglichen und wirklichen Verfügungsgewalt grundsätzlich rechnet und dass er es sich gefallen lässt, aufgerufen zu sein, auch praktisch immer und überall damit zu rechnen, das ist die Stellungnahme und Entscheidung dessen der an Jesus Christus glaubt." Barth says that this is the faith that Jesus did not find in Israel but did find in the pagan centurion. It is the "Zutrauen zu seiner Macht," which is asked of sick persons and others seeking aid. "Was wären alle vier Evangelien ohne den dauernden Hinweis auf diesen Machtbesitz und diese Machtübung Jesu und ohne den dauernden Aufruf zum Glauben an ihn gerade als diesen Machtträger? Eben als solcher ist er der Messias" (p. 38). As the Messiah Jesus shares in the power of God the Creator, fulfils the vow of Isaiah 65 : 17 f.

² See the section: Miracles and faith.

and then of the salvation of the pagans.¹ In the imagery of the Jewish world of ideas the glory of the Messianic kingdom is depicted as a feast at which the guests, i.e. the chosen and the just, will sit down with the patriarchs.² Jesus wished to make it clear to the Jews that the salvation to which they were first entitled as the Lord's people will be taken away from them and given to the pagans. "The children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness: there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth."³

Matthew ends his account with Jesus' words to the centurion:

¹ The connection is more evident in Lk. 13 : 28, 29 than in Mt. 8 : 5-13. See KEULERS, *Matthäus*. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, re Lk. 13 : 28, 29: "Das Drohwort über die Verwerfung des jüdischen Volkes, oder zum mindesten eines grossen Teils, ist dort [viz. Mt. 8 : 11 f.] offenbar in die Geschichte vom Hauptmann von Kapernaum nachträglich verflochten."

² According to old traditions feasts would be held in the aeon of salvation—either in the "days of the Messiah" or the Endzeit—at which, according to some traditions, among other things leviathan and behemoth, monsters of the Urzeit, would form the food for the righteous. Both in the pseudepigraphical writings (Enoch 60 : 7 ff.; IV Esdras 6 : 49 ff.; Apoc. of Baruch 29 : 4) and in those of the rabbis much is said about this. There were various names given to the feast: "feast of the righteous," "feast of redemption," "feast of the leviathan," "feast of Gan Eden." See STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 1144 ff.; DALMAN, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 90 ff.: "Aus den Evangelien ist zu entnehmen, dass der Gedanke an ein wirkliches Mahl der Frommen schon alt ist. Auch für Jesus war dies Mahl kein blosses Bild. Aber er redet bildlos davon doch nur, um auf die Gemeinschaft hinzuweisen, welche einst die Frommen aller Zeiten geniessen. Nie hat er das Mahl als solches angekündigt. Auch bei der 'Sättigung' in der Gottesherrschaft, von welcher Mt. 5, 6 (Lk. 6, 21) die Rede ist, wird nicht an ein Mahl gedacht. Sie ist vielmehr nach Jes. 65, 13 ff. bildlich von der vollen Befriedigung der jetzt Mangel Leidenden gemeint" (p. 91).

³ See STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 2, p. 1075 ff. The punishments which the godless undergo in Gehenna are both mental and physical. In IV Esdras 7 : 80-87 a description is given of the sevenfold mental torment which sinners suffer after death (p. 1026). The rabbinical writings expatiate at length on the physical pains of the godless in the hereafter. The principal means of punishment are darkness and fire. Later these punishments were supplemented by others: snow, smoke, thirst, etc. Enoch 108 : 3 ff. speaks of a "screaming and wailing in an immense, lonely place, and they will burn in a flame . . ." In Sanh. 10, 29b.57 reference is made to the weeping of the godless when they are cast first in the fire, then in the snow (see p. 1058 f.). Midr Qoh 1, 15 (11a) speaks of the gnashing of teeth: a criminal hurled into hell on account of his godless and impenitent life gnashed his teeth, ate his own flesh, rent his clothes and tore his hair out when he was not shown the slightest mercy. Cf. RENGSTORF, *TWNT*, III, p. 725, art. *κλαυθμός*, and I, p. 639 f., art. *βρυγμός*. According to Rengstorf *βρυγμός τῶν ὀδόντων* must not make us think: "an verzweiflungsvollen Ingrim und erst recht nicht an blosser körperliche Reaktion der Ausgeschlossenen auf die Kälte des Strafortes, sondern an die verzweiflungsvolle Reue, die den ganzen Körper erschüttert, wie sie ja auch den *κλαυθμός* zur Folge hat" (p. 640).

"Go thy way; and as thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And his servant was healed in the selfsame hour."

2. *The healing of the nobleman's son.* The encounter between Jesus and the nobleman took place at Cana, where the miracle at the wedding had earlier been performed.¹ It is not absolutely clear what position the man occupied; it is merely stated that he lived at Capernaum. It becomes evident from the account that he was a Jew.² This nobleman had a sick son, and when he had heard that Jesus had come from Judea to Galilee, he went to Him and requested Him to heal his son, who was at the point of death.³ Had the man approached Jesus as a "worker of miracles?"⁴ But Jesus did not want any faith that was confined to "belief in miracles."

¹ BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, regards Jn. 4 : 46a as an editorial link with the foregoing, in which the general situation is given. V. 46b forms the introduction to the account of the miracle. Verses 47-50 are: "das Korpus der Geschichte."

² καὶ ἦν τις βασιλικός, Jn. 4 : 46. Instead of βασιλικός some manuscripts have βασιλίσκος, i.e. little king (the Vulgate has *regulus*). βασιλικός means the same as βασιλείος, Ac. 12 : 20 f., viz. royal. Probably the man was a royal official in the service of Herod Antipas. BULTMANN, *op. cit.*: "Da im NT βασιλεύς für die Herodier üblich ist, während der Kaiser Καῖσαρ genannt wird (so auch Joh 19, 12.15), wird der βασις ein herodianischer Hofbeamter sein." Cf. SCHMIDT, *TWNT*, I, p. 593. BARRETT, *St. John*, points out, as Bultmann does, that troops and officials in the service of the Herods were called βασιλικοί by Flavius Josephus. "If, as is probable, this βασιλικός is to be identified with the centurion of Matt. 8. 5-13 = Luke 7. 1-10 we may think of him as an officer under Herod Antipas (who was not strictly a king but was a member of the royal Herodian house and was sometimes popularly referred to as a king—e.g. Mark 6. 14)." That the official was a Jew is evident from v. 48, since this word only has any meaning if it is spoken to a Jew . . . The nobleman is sometimes identified with Manaen, see Ac. 13 : 1, or with Chuza, Herod's steward, Lk. 8 : 3. However, nothing can be proved; see KEULERS, *Joannes*; TRENCH, *op. cit.*, p. 119, who considers it "not wholly improbable" that it was Chuza.

³ Cf. Jn. 4 : 47: "and besought him that he would come down, and heal his son" with Lk. 7 : 3: "beseeching him that he would come and heal his servant." For "come" the verb καταβαίνω, come down, descend, is used (cf. vv. 49 and 51). Cana was higher than Capernaum. Compare Jn. 4 : 47: "he was at the point of death," ἤμελλεν γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν with Lk. 7 : 2: "and ready to die," ἤμελλεν τελευτᾶν.

⁴ BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. The man approached Jesus with the "faith" that occurs among the Synoptists, viz. "belief in miracles." "Im Sinne des Evglisten ist freilich mit dem Auftreten Jesu ohne weiteres die Forderung des Glaubens an ihn als den Offenbarer gestellt; und für ihn ist es ein Missverständnis, wenn der 'Glaube' von Jesus wunderbare Befreiung von leiblicher Not erwartet. Nur so ist ja die Abweisung der Bitte des Vaters verständlich." Bultmann speaks of: "den naiven Wunderglauben, wie ihn die synopt. Tradition zeigt," which John obviously wished to "korrigieren" in his version. Cf. for this Synoptic belief in miracles *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 233 f. We

Jesus' first reaction was to ward off, to reproach the man. As in the Synoptic account, Jesus proves not to be prepared to grant the request forthwith. "Except ye see signs and wonders, ye will not believe." The nobleman ignored Jesus' words, which referred to the Jewish people in general, and repeated his entreaty: "Sir, come down ere my child die." As on the first occasion, he pointed out that this was a matter of life and death.¹ This time Jesus answered the father's prayer: "Go thy way; thy son liveth." In contrast with the accounts of Matthew and Luke, the initiative here was taken by Jesus; He did not go to the nobleman's house, but told him that his son "liveth," i.e. that he had been healed, that he was healthy and well again. By "live" Jesus meant live in the natural sense of the word.² The nobleman did not ask Jesus for a further explanation, but "believed the word that Jesus had spoken unto him, and he went his way." The report continues with a detailed account of the happy ending; the servants' message concerning the boy's well-being; the establishment of the hour of healing; the belief of the nobleman's whole family. Finally the Evangelist states that "this is again the second miracle that Jesus did, when he was come out of Judea into Galilee," verse 54.³

(c) *The disease and the method of treatment.*

In Matthew and Luke the disease from which the centurion's servant was suffering is referred to in only a few words. According to Mt. 8:6 the servant "lieth at home sick of the palsy, grievously tormented." Lk. 7:2 merely states that he was "sick" and "ready to die." In Jn. 4:47, 48 it is stated that the nobleman's son was "at the point of death," whilst

have stated our opinion in the section: Miracles and faith... As regards the combination "miracles and signs," see the chapter: Jesus' Miraculous Power.

¹ The word υἱός, son, used in v. 47, is replaced in v. 49 by παιδίον, the diminutive of παῖς, little child, small son. Some manuscripts have τὸν παῖδα; others τὸν υἱόν. The word introduces a sensitive note into the supplication.

² BULTMANN, TWNT, II, p. 862 f. In the New Testament: "life" (ζωή, ζῆν) is used in the first place to designate man's natural life. As in the Old Testament, "life" can also mean "das Leben in Gesundheit," see Mk. 5:23, Jn. 4:50... Cf. 1 Ki. 17:23: "See, thy son liveth."

³ KEULERS, Joannes, remarks that one must not envisage a "second miracle" in the absolute sense, since Jesus had also done miracles in Jerusalem, see Jn. 2:23. BULTMANN, Das Evangelium des Johannes: "Deutlich weist Vs. 54 auf 2, 11 zurück, und die Zählung stammt aus der Quelle, da 2, 23 dabei ignoriert ist" (p. 154, note 6). BARRETT, op. cit. "The whole verse refers back, through vv. 3, 43, to the miracle at the marriage feast at Cana."... πάλιν δεύτερον is pleonastic, cf. Jn. 21:16. See BLASS-DEBRUNNER, op. cit., § 484.

verse 52 states that "the fever left him." These are all data which in fact do not state the diseases, but merely indicate symptoms. A little further information is offered by Matthew's statement that the servant was suffering from "the palsy" and was "grievously tormented."¹

All that EBSTEIN finds to say is that this was "paralysis."² FENNER believes this to have been a case of hysterical paralysis.³ PAULUS puts forward the idea that the man was suffering from a nervous disorder.⁴

TRENCH believes that it may be derived from the combination of paralysis and violent pain that the man may have been suffering from paralysis with contraction of the joints. If, according to this scholar, this is coupled with tetanus, as happens much more frequently in the hot climate of the East and of Africa than in Europe, the combination causes terrible pain, with death soon ensuing.⁵ GODET says that this disease must have been a severe case of rheumatism.⁶ According to VON AMMON, the nobleman's son may be envisaged as having suffered from rheumatic fever.⁷ One of these many explanations may be more probable than the others, but one thing that is certain is that a correct diagnosis is out of the question.⁸

The three versions are unanimous in their account of the method of treatment; Jesus healed the servant (son) without having been personally in the presence of the patient. A number of differences occur in the details. Mt. 8 : 13 states that the servant recovered "in the selfsame hour," viz. the hour at which Jesus had spoken the redeeming word. Lk. 7 : 10 says nothing about a time. In John the time of recovery plays an important part; the father asked the servants who

¹ Mt. 8 : 6, παραλυτικός, δεινῶς βασανιζόμενος. Lk. 7 : 2, κακῶς ἔχων. Jn. 4 : 52, ἀφῆκεν αὐτὸν ὁ πυρετός. As regards παραλυτικός, see the chapter: The Healing of the Paralytics. βασανιζόμενος, see the chapter: Miracles and Medicine.

² EBSTEIN, Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud, p. 76: "Unter die Lähmungen ist wohl auch die Krankheit des Knechts des Hauptmanns von Kapernaum zu rechnen."

³ FENNER, Die Krankheit im N.T., p. 59: "Die Schilderung des Kranken der nach Matthäus grosse Qualen leidet, entspricht den heutigen Beobachtungen hysterischer Lähmungen, die mit heftigen Schmerzen verbunden sein können."

⁴ PAULUS, Exegetisches Handbuch, I, 2, p. 712. The man was "nervenkrank."

⁵ TRENCH, Notes on the Miracles, p. 229.

⁶ GODET, Lukas.

⁷ VON AMMON, Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu, I, p. 366.

⁸ GREYDANUS, Lukas. The disease is unknown. WEATHERHEAD, Psychology, Religion and Healing, p. 75. In none of the accounts "are we told what was really wrong."

had come to meet him about the hour at which "he began to amend."¹ This proved to correspond to the time at which Jesus had said to him: "thy son liveth."

The fourth Gospel confronts us with an additional difficulty as regards the computation of the time. In answer to the nobleman's question, the servants had said: "Yesterday at the seventh hour the fever left him." The seventh hour is one o'clock in the afternoon. Now it may be deduced from verse 50 that the man began his journey home after Jesus' encouraging words. It has been asked whether in that case he could not have been home the same day. According to DALMAN, the distance from Capernaum via Mammela, the present-day Hirbet Mamelia, is fifteen miles. It was a difficult route, and was a day's journey, even if the shortest way was followed. "If he set out before sunset," says DALMAN, "he could have reached his destination by the afternoon and have heard Jesus' reassuring words at the seventh hour (Jn. 4 : 52); however, on that day he would at most have covered half of the return journey to Mammela, so that the servants who came to meet him could have encountered him the next day on the Ginnesar plain."² This explanation seems plausible. For BULTMANN, who regards the end of the account in the light of the miracle style, and considers it dominated by the "theme of confirmation," there are no difficulties in this respect. He says that the servants have to function as "witnesses above suspicion." The miracle has to create an "impression."³

¹ κομψότερον ἔσχειν. This is the only instance of the expression in the New Testament. κομψῶς ἔχειν is, according to BARRETT, *op. cit.*: "a Hellenistic expression meaning 'to be well.' With the aorist it means 'to get better'."

² DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 113 f. "Dass man den verflossenen Tag am Abend 'gestern' genannt habe, so dass der Königische am gleichen Tage nach Haus zurückgekehrt wäre, ist nicht zu erweisen" (note 2, p. 114). KEULERS, Joannes, points to the weariness of men and beasts, which is said to have led the nobleman to decide to remain in Cana that day. But this does not tally with v. 50. "The difficulty disappears entirely," according to Keulers, "if 'yesterday' could be interpreted in accordance with the Jewish calculation, which has the new day begin with sunset. In that case it need only be supposed that the encounter took place fairly late on the same day (so argue Joüon and Braun)" . . . For the division of day and night, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 442.

³ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*: "Ob nach jüdischer oder römischer Zeit gerechnet ist . . . ist für die Pointe gleichgültig; ebenso ob die Entfernung zwischen Kana und Kapern . . . so gross ist, dass die Zeitangabe Wahrscheinlichkeit hat" (p. 154, note 2). Cf. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 88 f.: "Die novellistische Pointe ist hier die Gleichzeitigkeit von Jesu Wort und des Kranken Genesung—auch ein typisches Motiv der Wundergeschichten." Dibelius refers to the healing at a distance by Rabbi Hanina ben Dosa (for the text, see the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment).

Elsewhere we have discussed "healing at a distance."¹ We there stated our view that the New Testament healings at a distance must not be regarded as the effect of concentrated thought or that of paranormal forces, whereby we leave aside the many difficult problems which the above attempts at an explanation already entail in themselves.²

As long as attempts are made to approach these healings with the equipment of and by experimentation with our human mind — conscious, subconscious or paranormal — or as long as investigators are guided by our concepts of space and time, it will be impossible to arrive at an acceptable explanation or solution. For our concepts of space and time inevitably encounter difficulties in these cases. Think of the factor of immediacy. One might almost speak of "simultaneity:" the occurrence of healing coincided with the speaking of the words of healing; the word was an immediately working word. We must abandon any idea of a process, a favourable course of the disease or an autosuggestive force of the patient because he knew that the assistance of a great healer was being invoked for him. Think also of the problem of the "presence of God" in all places, of the "presence" of Jesus Christ. In this connection reference may be made to a study which LERLE devoted to the "spatial concept" in the New Testament. In a section on this concept in the Old Testament LERLE remarks that God is "simultaneously" near and far, see Jer. 23 : 23. LERLE goes on to say: "God is not bound to any part of the created world. However, there is no place where God's power would not be active." Reference may be made to the content of Psalm 139. "When God is present in one place, He is at the same time present in another place."³

¹ See the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment.

² WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 75, considers it "attractive" to think of therapeutic mental forces! "Here again it may be that at an unconscious level of the mind our Lord's mind actually made contact with that of the patient. It is attractive to think that in a sense Jesus did go to the patient as He promised to do (Matthew 8, 7), and that the therapeutic forces in His mind flowed into the deep mind of the patient, achieving his recovery." See also p. 236 ff., "The practice of intercession," in which Weatherhead at the same time points to new experiments in telepathy, to Jung's theory of the collective unconscious, etc. However important these matters may be or are considered to be in themselves, they have nothing to do with Jesus' deeds. In His work an event is accomplished which belongs to an entirely different order.

³ LERLE, *Das Raumverständnis im N.T.*, p. 40 ff. For man this knowledge is too wonderful, too exalted, he cannot attain to it, Ps. 139 : 6. "Der Mensch ist viel zu sehr in seiner massiven Dreidimensionalität befangen, als dass er diesen

LERLE therefore rightly says that the laws of time and space, such as we know them in this aeon, can be interrupted when in the "event of Christ" something enters our world from the other Aeon.¹ In healing at a distance, too, the "coming" of Jesus Christ as the One of Authority and the Bringer of salvation is manifest, and "something" of the other Aeon penetrates our world: the Kingdom of God functions in its own immediacy.

(d) *The nobleman's faith*

Various exegetes believe that the text gives rise to the view that a growth, an increase, took place in the nobleman's faith. It is their opinion that the man first believed in Jesus' power to perform miracles, Jn. 4 : 47, then appealed to Jesus' compassionate love, verse 49, and finally arrived at the true faith, verse 53. For instance, BULTMANN describes the faith displayed by the father in his second appeal as a "characteristic of true faith," though in a "provisional stage," which became "faith proper" in the next stage.² According to UBBINK the nobleman did not appeal to Jesus' power of working miracles in the second request, but to His compassion, after which his faith "increased."³ BARRETT

wunderbaren Sachverhalt voll begreifen könnte. Gott kann aber nicht nur gleichzeitig vor und hinter einem Menschen sein, sondern seine Präsenz reicht bis in die fernsten Regionen, sowohl auf der Erde und auf dem Weltmeer als auch über und unter dem Erdboden." . . . Lerle points to Isa. 57 : 15, which speaks of God's "inhabiting" in three respects: in the high place (heaven), in the holy place and "with him that is of a contrite and humble spirit." Here the problem of the transcendence of God arises. Lerle says that the transcendence presupposes a "dividing wall," but God also works in the "Innerweltliche" . . . For the problem of the transcendence and the immanence of God see the interesting remarks made by WENZL, *Die philosophischen Grenzfragen der modernen Naturwissenschaft*, pp. 42 and 60 ff.

¹ LERLE, op. cit., p. 114, concludes his study with these words: "Durch die Beschaffenheit des Raumes mit einer Eigengesetzlichkeit der drei Dimensionen ist Gott in seinem Handeln nicht eingengt. Jede Eigengesetzlichkeit des Stoffes und des Raumes, wie wir sie in diesem Äon vorfinden, kann durchbrochen werden, wo im Christusgeschehen etwas vom jenseitigen Reich Gottes, etwas vom anderen Äon in unsere Welt eindringt. Wo das Reich Gottes zu den Menschen kommt, da kann dieses Kommen weder durch eine Notwendigkeit der linearen, eindimensionalen Zeit, noch durch die Eigengesetzlichkeit des Raumes mit seinen drei Dimensionen von Länge, Breite und Höhe gehemmt werden."

² BULTMANN, op. cit., re Jn. 4 : 49. The Father shows: "ein Charakteristikum echten Glaubens, wenn gleich auf einer vorläufigen Stufe: er bleibt in der Erkenntnis seiner Hilfsbedürftigkeit. Das genügt, um die Gewährung der Bitte V. 50 zu erlangen." Re v. 53: "Für den Evglisten bedeutet aber dieses ἐπίστευσεν offenbar mehr als das bloße 'er wurde Christ'; es bildet den Schritt ab, der vom vorläufigen Glauben (V. 50) zum eigentlichen führt."

³ UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes*, re v. 52 f. "Now his faith increases

believes that it was not until verse 53 that the man became a "Christian."¹

However, the question is whether this concept of a stagewise development of faith is borne out by the text, quite apart from psychological questions which may be asked in this connection.

The first request, literally translated from indirect speech into direct, runs: "Lord, I beseech thee to come down and heal my son, for he is at the point of death," and the second, which is already in direct speech is "Sir, come down ere my child die." The requests have exactly the same content. The only comment that might perhaps be made is that the father pronounced the second request with a little more feeling. However, it is impossible to deduce from the second entreaty that the faith of the man had increased between the two requests or had acquired another content. Anyone who speaks of "stages" here builds his own stage! After Jesus' words: "Go thy way; thy son liveth," the father went his way, for he "believed the word that Jesus had spoken unto him." This can only mean that the nobleman had unconditional confidence in Jesus' word: that he definitely believed in Jesus' power and willingness to help. The fact that the father, when he met his servants, asked after the "hour" at which recovery had occurred need not be interpreted as a "favourite theme" in the miracle style, as BULTMANN sees it, but must be explained by the situation which normally tends to occur in such cases. The question: "when did he get better?" is a simple and obvious one, and it may be assumed that the father asked it right at the beginning of his meeting with his servants when he asked after his child.

Unlike BULTMANN, UBBINK, etc., we are of the opinion that it was not John's intention to demonstrate a growth or development of the nobleman's faith,² What he wanted to say was that that

(vv. 47, 49, 50, cf. 2, 11) to the height of that of the Samaritans (v. 41). He understands: human suffering appeals to Jesus' aid with a powerful voice."

¹ BARRETT, *op. cit.* Re v. 50: "The man believed the word," etc. "The man is not yet a Christian believer; contrast v. 53. He believes that what Jesus has said is true. Cf. Matt. 8.8; Luke 7.7, εἰπὲ λόγῳ." Re v. 53: "ἐπίστευσεν. The absolute use of the word (cf. 1. 7, 50 et al.) means 'he became a Christian'."

² Some scholars seem to have a certain feeling for tracking down ascending progressions, climaxes, etc. STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 156, was struck by an ascending progression in the accounts of the resurrection of the dead (Jairus' daughter was resurrected from a bed, the young man at Nain from a bier, Lazarus from a grave). DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, remarks with reference to Jn. 4 : 46: "We may note a progression in thought

faith which the man displayed from the beginning in his requests for aid, and which he proved by leaving after Jesus' words, was answered and confirmed by Jesus by his prayers being heard.¹

We should therefore not like to translate Jn. 4 : 53 by "and himself became a believer, and his whole house," which might create the impression that it was only now that the father really began to believe, but by: "and himself believed, and his whole house."²

(c) *Summary and conclusions*

The similarities in the texts of the Synoptic and Johannine traditions justify the view that each of the authors wished in his own way to put the event into words in the service of the proclamation. It may be said of this healing miracle, too, that the criterion by means of which the text is explored and evaluated is of vital importance to the acceptance or rejection of the historical nature of the story. Elsewhere we have discussed the views of the rationalists and that of STRAUSS, of a number of doctors and of other scholars who have concerned themselves with this matter.³ BULTMANN is of the opinion that Gemeindetheologie has been at work here. And who, he exclaims, still believes in healings at a distance today? ⁴ BULTMANN sends through his method of form

from the one incident to the other. In ch. II, the work of Christ is represented as the simple enhancement of life (water becomes wine). In chapter IV it is the rescue of life from the immediate threat of death and destruction. The progression reaches its culmination, as we shall see, in chapter XI, where life is actually victorious over death, in the raising of Lazarus" (p. 319).

¹ SMELIK, *De weg van het woord*, says that we must read this account: "with the tension which the father felt when he saw his child wrestling with death" (p. 105). Smelik rightly remarks: "The stress of this story falls on the adherence to the word. By the deed of returning the nobleman recognized that he was bound to Christ's word" (p. 106).

² *καὶ ἐπίστευσεν αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ὅλη*. Was the first "home congregation" formed here? KEULERS, *op. cit.*, believes that the specific mention of it gives rise to the supposition "that his house became known as a centre of propagation of the faith. The conversion of such prominent persons must have had a particular effect." BARRETT, *op. cit.* "We can only guess what the conversion of the officer's house implied; in fact John has probably imported into this gospel narrative an event of a kind familiar to him (as to the author of Acts) in the later mission of the Church." BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 154: "Dass das Wunder zur Folge hat, dass der Vater und sein ganzes Haus gläubig werden, entspricht dem sonstigen Schluss von Wundergeschichten, in dem der Eindruck des Wunders geschildert wird. Dies traditionelle Motiv ist unter dem Einfluss der Mission und ihrer Terminologie umgestaltet worden."

³ See the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment.

⁴ BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 39. They are: "ideale Szenen," which one: "als Gemeindebildung betrachten muss; auch wird sich

criticism the powerful current of modern rational thought which washes away the historicity of the miracle.

It seems to us that there is no reason to query the historicity of this healing on the ground that, as far as its wonderful nature is concerned, it differs too greatly from the other healings of Jesus. Here the definition which the centurion gave in his striking analogy may help us to "understand" the miracle. Belief in the absolute power of the One of Authority implies the certainty that a command pronounced by that One of Authority will be obeyed, irrespective of human life in and reckoning with dimensions.

In the healing of the sick servant (son) the Kingship of Jesus functioned in the immediate display of His power and compassion. At the same time this miracle has the unmistakable character of the sign. In two ways it manifests the limitless power and love of Jesus.

It does so firstly in the spatial sense, since His word at a distance had a re-creative and renovating effect. It does so secondly in the universal sense, since Jesus showed that salvation was not confined to the Jewish people, but that pagans believing in Him could also share in the fullness of the salvation which He had brought to man. And therefore this miracle is a sign of the coming of the new Kingdom, which in the most absolute sense of the word knows no bounds.

kaum Jemand für die Geschichtlichkeit der Fernheilungen einsetzen." KÖHLER, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des N.T.*, rightly comments on these words by Bultmann: "Wir stellen bloss fest, dass Bultmann hier die evangelischen Berichte aus Erwägungen der ratio des Profanhistorikers für ungeschichtlich erklärt" (p. 19).

X. THE HEALING OF PETER'S MOTHER-IN-LAW

The Synoptists tell of the healing of Peter's mother-in-law in Peter's house.¹ The accounts are not identical. Matthew has the account of Peter's mother-in-law immediately follow on the story of the healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum. Jesus entered Peter's house and saw his mother-in-law lying in bed with a fever, Mt. 8 : 14. In Mark and Luke the account comes immediately after the story of the healing of a demoniac in the synagogue at Capernaum. This is why they both give Jesus' starting-place. Mark states in detail that the house belongs to Simon and Andrew, and that James and John were also among the company, Mk. 1 : 29, cf. Lk. 4 : 38. According to Mark and Luke the disciples invoked Jesus' aid for the sick woman.

Jesus' mode of action is stated in various ways. Matthew writes: "And he touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose, and ministered unto them," 8 : 15. Mark says: "And he came and took her by the hand, and lifted her up; and immediately the fever left her, and she ministered unto them," 1 : 31. Luke's version is: "And he stood over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her: and immediately she arose and ministered unto them," 4 : 39.² In the descriptions which Matthew and Mark give of the happenings it is evident that Jesus stood beside or before the bed. Luke's version most strongly stresses the idea that the fever was regarded as a usurper. But this also finds expression in Matthew's text. Jesus saw Peter's mother-in-law "laid, and sick of a fever," as a result of which she was powerless.³ It is quite clear that Luke has a demon in mind

¹ Mt. 8 : 14-15, Mk. 1 : 29-31, Lk. 4 : 38-39 . . . According to DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 163, Peter's house was probably not far from the synagogue at Capernaum. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, says that Peter's house here is Jesus' "Absteigequartier." SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 55, considers the story to be closely connected with the preceding one, and therefore to be fairly reliable from the topographical and chronological points of view. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 226, classifies the account among the "Wundergeschichten." According to HELD, *Mt. als Interpret der Wundergeschichten* (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-ev., p. 159 ff.), Mark and Matthew in this account show Jesus as the Saviour of the sick, whilst Luke emphasizes Jesus' miraculous feat.

² Some manuscripts have "ministered unto him" in the text of Matthew.

³ βεβλημένην καὶ πυρέσσουσαν. The translation should be: "thrown on a bed by a fever." Cf. EITREM, *Demonology*, p. 29, note 4: Mt. 8 : 14 is: "thrown on

who had to be driven out. First Jesus went and "stood over her," which may be interpreted as "bending over her."¹ EITREM says that the simple and vivid story told by Mark has been changed by Luke into a scene of exorcism. He refers to parallels: the pronouncement of words and formulas "above (over) the head" of N.N.²

Then comes the oral action: Jesus "rebukes" the fever, with healing as the immediate result. We encounter the rebuking of demons elsewhere, e.g. Mk. 1 : 25.³ GREYDANUS, like CALVIN, points to the occurrence of disease as a punishment for sin, so that one can therefore speak in general of "rebuking." The fever from which Peter's mother-in-law was suffering might have been the work of demons.⁴

In the text handed down by Matthew and Mark Jesus' actions did not take the form of words, but were tactile. Matthew states that Jesus "touched" the woman's hand. According to Mark the action was accompanied by a certain "force:" Jesus approached the woman and lifted her up, after He had "laid hold of" her hand.⁵

a bed of sickness,' the fever really acts in person (it is more than the dictionaries' simple 'sick in bed')." HAUCK, TWNT, I, p. 525, interprets it as "darniederliegen."

¹ ἐπιστὰς ἐπάνω αὐτῆς, see BAUER, Griech.-deu. Wörterbuch, who puts forward as a possibility the interpretation: "sich über sie beugend." GREYDANUS, Lukas. "(Bent) over her" or "at her bed-head." KLOSTERMANN, Das Lukas-evangelium, rejects the translation: "über sie sich beugend" . . . For the rules of visiting the sick, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1, p. 573 ff. Visitors were not permitted to sit on the bed or on a chair, but had to use the floor.

² EITREM, op. cit., p. 29 f. . . . K. WEISS, TWNT, VI, p. 958 f.: "Bei Lukas ist es unbezweifelbar, dass er die Heilung der Schwiegermutter des Petrus als Exorcismus verstanden hat . . ."

³ STAUFFER, TWNT, II, p. 620 ff. The New Testament uses the word ἐπιτιμάω, rebuke, in particular: "wenn es . . . das (machtwirkende) Drohen und Schelten als Vorrecht Gottes und seines Christus behandelt . . . ἐπιτιμᾶν ist Herrenrecht. Darum steht es vor allem Gott zu." Jesus assails the fever as a personal opponent. Cf. HAUCK, Lukas. "Auch das Fieber ist wie noch heute in Palestina dämonisch gedacht. Jesus nimmt zu Häupten der Kranken seinen Standort und bedroht (so Luk) das Fieber bzw den Fieberdämon." PAULUS, Exegetisches Handbuch, I, 2, p. 443, wonders how this "rebuking" takes place. "Auf alle Fälle, um auf die Kranke, nicht um auf die Krankheit, einen Eindruck zu machen!"

⁴ GREYDANUS, Lukas. CALVIN, Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas, re Lk. 4 : 39: "for fever and other sicknesses, famine, plague and every kind of distress are officers of God through whom He executes His judgments." (. . . febris enim et alii morbi, fames, pestilentia, et omne genus aerumnae, Dei sunt apparitores per quos iudicia sua exequitur). CANAAN, Dämonenglaube, p. 9, recalls the female demon Imm Maldam, who, according to a belief that was prevalent in Palestine, causes fever.

⁵ Matthew 8 : 15 has ἥψατο from ἅπτω, i.e. touch, be in contact with, take hold of. Mk. 1 : 31 has κρατήσας from κρατέω, i.e. seize, take possession of, hold

PREUSS draws attention to the procedure followed by Rabbi Johanan and Rabbi Hanina, who held out their hands to their patients to help them to stand up. Stretching forth the hand may also serve to support the oral suggestion, as was the case with Peter's mother-in-law, according to PREUSS.¹

Only vague surmises can be voiced regarding the disease from which Peter's mother-in-law suffered. In the ancient world fever was regarded as an independent disease and not as a symptom accompanying all kinds of diseases. Nor does the description which Luke gives — the woman "was taken with a great fever" — help at all to identify the disease, whatever medical sounds some scholars may believe that they hear in the words used by Luke.²

In the Talmud fever is described as a fire, which comes to the fore in various names given to it. A whole series of remedies and conjurations against fever are listed.³

tight. The concept *κρατός* (power, might, force) is contained in this verb. The correct translation of Mt. 8 : 15 is "took hold of," but Mk. 1 : 31 should be translated as follows: "seizing her hand, he lifted her up." For the verb *κρατέω*, see MICHAELIS, TWNT, III, p. 905 ff. BLASS-DEBRUNNER, *Neutest. Gramm.*, § 170. Cf. the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment . . . MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 82, assumes that Jesus not only touched the woman's hand, but also spoke therapeutic words to her. He also thinks that she would have learned that a miracle had taken place in the synagogue.

¹ PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 162 f. See Ber. 5b on R. Johanan and R. Hanina . . . "In noch anderen Fällen bemächtigt sich der Arzt der Hand des Kranken und richtet ihn auf als Unterstützung der verbalen Suggestion, wie bei der fieberkranken Schwiegermutter des Apostels Simon."

² Lk. 4 : 38, *συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ*. The expression: "taken with a fever" also occurs elsewhere. Cf. also Acts 28 : 8: "the father of Publius lay sick of a fever and of a bloody flux" . . . Since the celebrated physician Galen states that physicians make a distinction between "heavy," *μέγας*, and "light," *μικρός*, fever, it is thought that Luke is using a technical term from the medical world here. PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 443, presumes, referring to Galen's distinction, that Luke is speaking "medizinisch" here. So do the following: PLUMMER, *St. Luke*; GREYDANUS, *Lukas*; HAUCK, *Lukas*, and KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*. See also KÖSTER, TWNT, VII, p. 880 f.

³ There proves to be a connection in Greek between *πῦρ*, fire, and *πυρετός*. A similar connection exists in Latin between *febris* (fever) and *fervere* (glow; fervor = heat). A few Hebrew names are: *קִדְחַת* (Lev. 26 : 16 and Deu. 28 : 22)

= fever; *קָדַח* = ignite. *דִּלְקַת* (Deu. 28 : 22) = fever; *דָּלַק* = burn. *חֶמֶה* = sun, warmth, fever. The Aramaic *אִשְׁתָּא* = fire, fever. *חֲרָךְ* (Deu. 28 : 22) = fever; *חָרַר* = burn, glow. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 479, lists 15 Hebrew and Aramaic names for fever. He mentions all kinds of remedies and conjurations. PREUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 182 ff., devotes a chapter to: "Fieber." He says: "Das Fieber ist natürlich den Alten stets eine Krankheit für sich, nicht nur ein Symptom: 'der Vater des Publius liegt an πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίᾳ' nicht an fieberhafter Ruhr,

Although the data are inadequate to identify the disease, various scholars nevertheless feel themselves capable of giving a possible diagnosis. EBSTEIN does not concern himself with the cause of the disease, but he says that it is possible for fever to be subdued without our knowing how.¹ FENNER thinks that we should not envisage an organic disease. It was probably an essential fever, a "nervous hyperthermia."² In an incidental comment DALMAN says that this is a case of malaria.³ According to TRAUB we are probably concerned here with a confusion between fever and nightmare.⁴

Although nothing can be said for certain about the disease, this is not the case with the healing. The Synoptists recount the healing most positively: the woman stood up — Luke adds "immediately" — and "ministered unto them."⁵

We must take this ministering to mean the duties which one has towards one's guests, and in particular the preparation of a meal.⁶

Some suppose that the addition "and ministered unto them" has

wie wir sagen würden." EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*, p. 220, points to Rabbi Eleazar's definition of fever, see *Ber.*, V, I. Fever is "a fire in the bones." "Wir ersehen aus dieser Erklärung," says Ebstein, "so verschoben sie auch ausschauen mag, dass die Aerzte jener Zeit unter Fieber eine mit lebhafter Hitze einhergehende Affektion verstanden haben, welche sie zum Teil wenigstens in den Knochen lokalisierten."

¹ EBSTEIN, *op. cit.*, p. 103, re Mt. 8 : 14 and parallel passages. "Übrigens aber dürfte kein Arzt den geringsten Zweifel daran haben, dass in den erwähnten Fällen das Fieber wirklich geschwunden ist. Wir begegnen doch oft genug Fällen, bei denen das Fieber aufhört, ohne dass wir uns über die Gründe Rechenschaft geben können."

² FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 52, re Lk. 4 : 38. This may have been a state of delirium: "wie sie z.B. bei Hysterie in Form von Wahnvorstellungen vorkommen." FENNER refers to a pronouncement by E. Bleuler, *Psychisches und Physisches in der Pathologie*, 1916, p. 44: "Dass es psychogenes Fieber gibt, ist jetzt sicher."

³ DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 163. In Peter's house not far from the synagogue: "hat er des Jüngers Schwiegermutter von ihrer Malaria geheilt." J. Weiss likewise envisages malarial fever, see HAUCK, *Markus*, who, however, rightly says himself: "Grund und Art des Fiebers, das die Frau ans Lager fesselt (κατεκ.) zu nennen, ist unmöglich." WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 61: "The report that Jesus 'rebuked' the fever (Luke 4, 39) sounds like suggestion used to lower the temperature to normal. The fever may have been malaria."

⁴ TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.*, p. 40: "Wahrscheinlich haben wir es hier mit der häufigen Verwechslung von Fieber und Alptraum (ήπιλος und έπιλος) zu tun."

⁵ HAUCK, *Markus*, thinks that the striking aspect of Jesus' feat finds expression not only in the cessation of the fever: "sondern auch darin, dass die zu erwartende Mattigkeit nicht eintritt."

⁶ Cf. Lk. 10 : 40, Jn. 12 : 2 . . . For the ministering, διακονέω, see BEYER, *TWNT*, II, p. 84. Peter's mother-in-law looks after: "die Gäste im Hause."

a greater significance than a matter-of-fact statement or a demonstration of the healing. According to SCHLEIERMACHER it is natural that Jesus healed the woman, otherwise she could not have performed her duties.¹ VAN LEEUWEN and DEHN deduce from the words that a change took place in the woman's soul. A strained situation had probably arisen between Jesus and Peter's mother-in-law because Peter had abandoned everything to follow Jesus. And as a result Peter could no longer provide for his family. Jesus' deed, in which His power and His mercy were manifest, removed this strain. "And she must have served the company with joy," says VAN LEEUWEN.² In this way the woman, besides physical recovery, had found spiritual recovery in her faith in and renewed communion with the Healer.

¹ SCHLEIERMACHER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 220. Peter's mother-in-law was not called by Jesus: "aber als sie geheilt war, diente sie Christo und den Anderen: also ihre *διακονία* war in Anspruch genommen."

² VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*. Cf. DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*. BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, *Markus*. "The expression at the end of this short account of healing: 'and she ministered unto them,' is more than a demonstration of the successful treatment: the figures in the background are involved in the movement and affected by the force of this mysterious person." LIGHTFOOT, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*, p. 22, remarks that the account is of "a very simple type," and that it: "would lose greatly in impressiveness, if the identity of the patient were not mentioned. Probably therefore it was from the beginning a story about this particular person, and historically we stand here on firm ground."

XI. THE HEALING OF MALCHUS' EAR

The "last healing miracle" (Keulers) which Jesus performed is said to have been the healing of Malchus' ear. The incident in the garden of Gethsemane is related by all the Evangelists, but there are considerable differences in the versions.¹ According to Matthew and Mark the enemies of Jesus had already laid hands on Him (Mt. 26 : 50, Mk. 14 : 46), when "one of them which were with Jesus" (Matthew) or "one of them that stood by" (Mark) drew his sword, struck a servant of the high priest, and cut off his ear.² Neither Matthew nor Mark says anything about the healing of the ear. Luke states that the disciples said to Jesus when they saw what was going to happen: "Lord, shall we smite with the sword?", Lk. 22 : 49. After "one of them" had cut off the "right ear" — both Luke and John refer to the right ear — of the high priest's servant, Jesus replied: "Suffer ye thus far."³ Luke is the only Evangelist to add: "And he touched his ear, and healed him."⁴ Luke then recounts the seizing of Jesus, Lk. 22 : 54. John adds a couple of details, firstly that it was Simon Peter who wielded the sword, and secondly that the victim's name was Malchus. Was Malchus the leader, or was he perhaps the closest?⁵

¹ Mt. 26 : 51, 52; Mk. 14 : 47; Lk. 22 : 49-51; Jn. 18 : 10, 11.

² μάχαιρα, gladium, was originally a knife, later a small sword, a dagger. Cf. MICHAELIS, TWNT, IV, p. 530 ff.; GALLING, Bibl. Reallexikon, col. 129 ff., col. 472 ff., the articles "Dolch" and "Schwert."

³ The words "Suffer ye thus far," ἕξτε ἕως τούτου, Lk. 22 : 51, are capable of various interpretations. The intonation was doubtless of importance here. It is improbable that Jesus said this to His enemies, in the sense of: leave me free to heal the wounded man. It is addressed to the disciples, whom Jesus forbade the further use of arms. Cf. KLOSTERMANN, Das Lukasevangelium, who states the above interpretation and also the possible meaning: "lasst es zu, sogar bis zu diesem Punkt, bis zu meiner Verhaftung."

⁴ D it has: "and stretching forth his hand he touched him and his ear was healed." BARRETT, St. John, thinks that John does not mention the healing of the ear not because he did not know Luke but probably because he considered it "inappropriate that such a cure should have been performed; the gulf between Jesus and his adversaries, between light and darkness, was now unbridgeable."

⁵ KEULERS, Mattheüs, thinks that there was only one of the high priest's servants among the multitude: "he was called Malchus (John) and was perhaps the leader. The Roman soldiers apparently contented themselves with looking on" . . . The name Malchus occurred on other occasions; see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 568. BULTMANN, Das Evangelium des Johannes, p. 496, note 1, asks: "War Malchus Araber und also Sklave?" PLUMMER, St. Luke: "Malchus was

A certain development, a growth, may be perceived in the accounts: the ear becomes the right ear, Luke tells of the healing and the fourth Evangelist is able to give the names of the swordsman and the victim.¹

Luke's text is obscure: the ear had been cut off, and yet Jesus touched it and healed him. How can these be reconciled with one another?

MICKLEM therefore supposes that Luke mixed two traditions. Luke 22 : 50 corresponds to Mark's account: the ear had been cut off. But what about the healing? If the ear was healed, it could have been injured, but not entirely cut off.² And it is hardly conceivable that a new ear was fitted. Tradition has handed down the incident in the garden of Gethsemane in different versions which cannot be brought in line with one another.

A number of exegetes do not wish to regard this healing as an act of mercy. Jesus merely wanted to make amends for a false step by one of His followers. PLUMMER thinks that the victim was healed because this act might lead to Jesus being accused of being a danger to the state. The disciples could not be permitted to hamper the arrest. GODET shares this view: both Jesus' cause and Peter's safety would be endangered.³

probably taking a prominent part in the arrest, and Peter aimed at his head." In Jn. 18 : 26 a kinsman of the victim is mentioned. BARRETT, *op. cit.*, comments on this verse: "We must conclude either that behind the Johannine passion narrative there stands a first-hand source, or that John is himself elaborating details in the manner of the apocryphal gospels. The general lack of coherence in the narrative does not confirm the former alternative." See also BLINZLER, *Der Prozess Jesu*, p. 74.

¹ BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 516, draws attention to the "Gesetz der Fortbildung," viz. the giving of details and the answering of questions, of which we find an example in the Malchus episode. Cf. OEPKE, *TWNT*, III, p. 205: "Wie die Formgeschichte im einzelnen gezeigt hat, ist Ausmalung der überlieferten Umrisse so wenig ausgeschlossen wie das Nachwachsen völlig neuer Berichte." BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 496, note 1, speaks of a: "novellistisch-legendarische Fortentwicklung." Cf. *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, pp. 306 and 338.

² MICKLEM, *Miracles and the New Psychology*, p. 127 f.: "Ver. 51 by itself clearly suggests that the ear was not completely severed." "It therefore looks as though Luke had conflated two traditions; (1) that of Mk., which simply records that the man's ear was cut off, and (2) a tradition which tells of the healing of the ear which had been wounded by a stroke with a sword." PLUMMER, *St. Luke*: "Lk. the physician alone records this solitary miracle of surgery. A complete restoration of the ear is meant and required." VAN VELDHUIZEN, *Lukas de Medicijnmeester*: "The most plausible theory seems to me to be that Jesus healed the part of the ear which had not been cut off" (p. 113).

³ GODET, *Lukas*.

GREYDANUS, on the other hand, is of the opinion that even in these circumstances Jesus still showed Himself the merciful and the healer.¹

At the same time this healing miracle is believed to give evidence of the fact that He who was arrested was not powerless.²

If we consider the whole, we wonder whether Luke's version might not have been the result of a misunderstanding of the sources;³ using the present text of Luke a "reconstruction" of the incident — leaving out of consideration the element of a wonderful healing — is impossible.⁴

However, this account occupies a striking place in the proclamation of the "non-violent" character of the Christian faith.

¹ GREYDANUS, Lukas.

² Jesus demonstrated His "power" of obedience. BRANDT, *Das ewige Wort*: "Die Tat des Petrus ist eine im tiefsten Grunde ohnmächtige Gebärde im Vergleich zu der Macht des gehorsamen Sohnes."

³ MICKLEM, *op. cit.*, p. 128, note 1: "It has been suggested that the account of the cure is due to a misunderstanding of an Aramaic original which really referred to the restoring (or the command to restore) the sword to its sheath." Cf. WEATHERHEAD, *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, p. 56 f.

⁴ A reconstruction would have to take into account the question already asked: how can Jesus have "touched" the ear when this was no longer there? For it is not said that Jesus touched the place where the ear had been, but the ear itself (τὸ ὠτίον = the outer ear, the organ). The contradiction inherent in the text itself gives rise to the suspicion that the account of this healing does not have a historical foundation.

XII. THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD

(a) *Jewish, Christian and pagan accounts of the resurrection of the dead*

The miracles of Jesus include the accounts of a number of raisings from the dead. Matthew, Mark and Luke tell of the raising of Jairus' daughter; ¹ Luke relates the resurrection of the young man at Nain, Lk. 7 : 11-17, and John recounts the raising of Lazarus, Jn. 11 : 1-44. Acts includes the stories of the resuscitations of Tabitha or Dorcas and of Eutychus. ² The Old Testament tells of the raising of the son of the widow woman of Zarephath by Elijah, of the Shunammite's son by Elisha and of the man who revived as a result of touching Elisha's bones in his sepulchre. ³

As with the other miracles of Jesus, it may again be seen here that Jesus did not perform any absolutely new miracles, but that the power to give life again to the dead was also ascribed to others. The Talmud speaks in several places of resurrections of the dead.

According to STRACK-BILLERBECK the following data on this subject are to be found in the rabbinical writings.

(a) The resurrection of the dead is exclusively God's work. Rabbi Johanan, who died in 279, once said that there are three keys in the hand of God which may be placed in no other hand, viz. that for the making of rain, that for the opening of the womb and that for the resurrection of the dead.

(b) The just shall raise the dead, an idea which a number of rabbis found to be signified in Isaiah 5 : 17, Micah 7 : 14 and Zechariah 8 : 4.

(c) The resurrection of the dead is part of the work of the Messiah who, on the strength of his name, Ps. 72 : 17, shall awaken the sleepers.

(d) Rabbis can also raise the dead. ⁴ Regarding the latter, one of the stories told is the following. One of the pupils of Rabbi — perhaps this was Rabbi Simeon ben Halafta, ca. 190 A.D. — brought back a servant of Antoninus from the dead. ⁵ Rabbi Hanina ben Hama, ca. 225, did the same. ⁶ Rabbah, died 330, and Rabbi Ze'ira once celeb-

¹ Mt. 9 : 18-26; Mk. 5 : 22-43; Lk. 8 : 41-56.

² Ac. 9 : 36-43; 20 : 9-12.

³ 1 Ki. 17 : 17 ff.; 2 Ki. 4 : 18 ff.; 2 Ki. 13 : 20, 21.

⁴ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 523 f., where the literature is also mentioned.

⁵ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 560.

⁶ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 560.

rated Purim together, in the course of which Rabbah murdered Rabbi Ze'ira whilst drunk. The next day he begged for mercy and brought him back to life. But when Rabbah suggested in the following year that they again celebrate Purim together, Ze'ira answered: a miracle does not happen every hour! ¹ FIEBIG refers to a text from the tannaitic period, i.e. from the beginning of the Christian era to about 200, in which it is asked where in Holy Writ it is said that reverence for the rabbi is akin to that for heaven, i.e. for God. On the strength of Numbers 11 : 28 it is established that the rabbis may destroy, whilst it is concluded from 2 Ki. 4 : 29 that the rabbi can kill and bring to life. FIEBIG concludes from this that in the days in which Jesus lived the resurrection of the dead was also ascribed to the rabbis. ²

Reference is often made to resurrections not only in Jewish and Christian writings, but also in pagan literature.

Apollonius of Tyana is said to have raised an aristocratic bride from the dead in Rome. ³ LUCIANUS has the physician Antigonus tell

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I. p. 560. See also II, p. 545.

² FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 36 f. The passage reads: "Und in Übereinstimmung hiermit findest du betreffs des Gehasi, dass zu ihm sagte Elisa (2 Kön. 4, 29): 'Gürte deine Lenden und nimm meinen Stab in deine Hand.' Da begann er sich zu stützen auf seinen Stock und zu gehen. Da sagten sie (d.h. die Leute) zu ihm: wohin gehst du, Gehasi? Da sagte er zu ihnen: einen Toten zu beleben. Da sagten sie (zu ihm): und bist du denn etwa imstande, einen Toten zu beleben, ist es nicht Jahwe, der tötet und lebendig macht? Da sagte er zu ihnen: auch mein Lehrer (Rabbi) tötet und macht lebendig" (*Mechilta, Vajehi, beschallach*, Par. 1, Friedmann, p. 53b, *Winter-Wünsche*, p. 169 f.) . . . Resurrections of the dead also occur in the so-called *Apophthegmata Patrum*, a collection of writings in Greek which are probably the work of Coptic speakers, from approx. 500 A.D. Mention is even made of a case in which a miracle-worker raised someone without knowing that he was concerned with one already dead by saying: arise, go outside! See DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 172 ff.

³ *VITA APOLL.*, IV, 45: "Apollonius also wrought this miracle at Rome: a marriageable maiden had died, to all appearance, and her betrothed was following her bier, lamenting their uncompleted nuptials, as is the custom, and all the city was mourning with him, for the girl was of consular family. Apollonius, happening upon this mournful sight, said: Set down the bier, and I will put an end to your tears for the maiden! He asked at the same time what her name was, and many supposed that he intended to deliver the customary funeral oration, in order to increase their grief; but by merely touching the body, and murmuring a few words over her, he woke the girl from her seeming death, and she found her voice at once, and returned to her father's house, like Alcestis when called back to life by Hercules. Her family offered him one hundred and fifty thousand denarii, but he told them that he presented it to the maiden as her dowry. Now whether he had discerned in her a spark of life which had been hidden from her physicians (for Zeus is said to have sent a shower of rain which was streaming

the following story: "I know someone who on the twentieth day after his burial rose again, and I had this man under my medical care both before his death and after his resurrection."¹ The deity Aesculapius did not raise any dead in his temple at Epidaurus, but it is told that he, as a physician and a hero, brought back to life six persons; however, this so aroused the wrath of Zeus that he killed him with his thunderbolt.²

from her upturned face), or whether he actually called back and rekindled her departed spirit, is hard to decide, not only for me, but for those who were present at the time" (transl. Eells).

¹ LUCIANUS, *Philopseudes*, 26. See BETZ, *Lukian von Samosata und das N.T.*, p. 161.

² HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidaurus*, p. 142. For the textual material, see EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, pp. 7 f.; 9 f.; 13 f.; 15 f.; 33 f.; 37 ff.; 42 f.; 49 f.; 54; 58 f.; 112... For the resurrection by Asclepiades see PLINY, *Nat. Hist.*, VII, XXXVII, 124: "But the highest reputation belongs to Asclepiades of Prusa, for having founded a new school, despised the envoys and overtures of King Mithridates, discovered a method of preparing medicated wine for the sick, brought back a man from burial and saved his life, but most of all for having made a wager with fortune that he should not be deemed a physician if he were ever in any way ill himself: and he won his bet, as he lost his life in extreme old age by falling downstairs." (*Summa autem Asclepiadi Prusiensi condita nova secta, spretis legatis et pollicitationibus Mithridatis regis, reperta ratione qua vinum aegris medetur, relato e funere homine et conservato, sed maxime sponsione facta cum fortuna ne medicus crederetur si umquam invalidus ullo modo fuisset ipse: et vicit suprema in senecta lapsu scalarum exanimatus*). Cf. for the skill of the ex-rhetor and physician Asclepiades also XXVI, VII... The same story also occurs in APULBIUS, *Florida*, IV, XIX. Because of a number of similarities to the accounts in the Gospels, but also to show the great differences, the account will be given here in full: "Le célèbre Asclépiade, un des plus grands médecins, et leur maître à tous si vous en exceptez le seul Hippocrate, le premier aussi imagina d'appliquer le vin au soulagement des malades, mais, bien entendu, en le donnant à propos: ce qu'il savait parfaitement reconnaître par l'extrême attention avec laquelle il étudiait sur les veines les pulsations irrégulières ou celles qui étaient satisfaisantes. Un jour donc qu'il rentrait dans la ville et revenait de son jardin du faubourg, il vit sur les boulevards extérieurs un grand convoi dressé, et une foule considérable de gens qui, venus pour les funérailles, se tenaient debout à l'entour en habits de deuils dans l'attitude d'une profonde tristesse. Il s'avance plus près, afin de savoir aussi, curiosité naturelle à l'esprit humain, quel était ce mort, attendu que personne n'avait répondu à ses questions; peut-être, du reste, songeait-il à faire sur le cadavre quelque remarque dans l'intérêt de son art. Ce qu'il y a de certain, c'est que cet homme étendu là et presque mis en terre fut par lui enlevé au trépas. Asclepiade contemplait ce malheureux, dont tous les membres avaient été déjà saupoudrés d'aromates, dont le visage était déjà recouvert d'une pommade odorante, et en l'honneur de qui l'on préparait déjà le repas funèbre, lorsque certains signes le frappèrent. Il redouble l'attention, il tâte le corps à plusieurs reprises, et reconnaissant qu'il recèle un principe de vie: 'cet homme n'est pas mort', s'écrie-t-il à l'instant: 'qu'on éloigne donc ces torches, qu'on écarte ces feux; qu'on démolisse ce bûcher, que ce repas funéraire soit reporté du cercueil à la table.' Des murmures, cependant, s'étaient élevés: les

The "divine men" of the ancient world, wise men, sorcerers, magicians, astrologers, miracle healers, etc., were therefore considered capable of performing all kinds of startling feats.¹

But no less startling are the stories which apocryphal literature has preserved about the feats of the apostles. The following resurrections were ascribed to the apostle Paul: in Antioch;² in Myra;³ the resurrection of Phrontina, who had been cast from a rock;⁴ the raising of Patroclus, the cup-bearer of Nero, who had fallen from a high window-ledge.⁵ In a "letter from Titus, Paul's pupil," it is stated that Peter once raised from the dead the only daughter of a gardener.⁶ Thomas is credited with the resurrection of a young man who had been killed by a large dragon and whose body the apostle had happened upon. The dragon was slain and the young man restored to life.⁷ At Thomas' command a young man who had

uns disaient qu'il fallait croire le médecin, les autres allaient jusqu'à se moquer de la médecine. Enfin, malgré les proches parents eux-mêmes, était-ce chez eux désir de l'héritage, ou n'ajoutaient-ils pas encore foi à ses paroles? après bien des oppositions et des difficultés, Asclépiade obtint pour le mort un instant de délai; et l'ayant ainsi arraché des mains des fossoyeurs comme des griffes de l'enfer (c'était revenir de loin) il le réinstalla dans son logis. Là il ne tarda pas à ranimer son souffle par la vertu de certains remèdes, et à provoquer la réapparition de la vie cachée dans l'enveloppe de ce corps" (transl. Bétolaud). Cf. further WEINREICH, *Antike Heilungswunder*, p. 171 ff.; FIEBIG, *Antike Wundergeschichten*.

¹ See the interesting chapter "Volksglaube" in PREISKER, *Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 175 ff. . . . EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, II, p. 45, says the following about the desire of physicians in the ancient world to "conquer" death: "To be rescued from death was the highest expectation, the greatest hope which the ancients cherished in regard to medicine. Its fulfilment was held to be the most adroit feat of the physician. Some human doctors pretended, or were reputed, to have achieved this task. But for the average physician, it remained a goal that was inaccessible to him; in vain, he aspired to reach it. The son of Apollo the god of medicine, the pupil of Chiron the wise Centaur, however, attained that perfection of which the others fell short through the inadequacy of their art." Edelstein refers not only to the accounts about Empedocles, Diogenes Laertius, VIII, 67, and Asclepiades (see above), but also to texts which speak of special skills and healings by physicians: Plato, *Charm.*, 156D; Herodotus, III, 130; Callimachus, *Hymnus in Apollinem*, 46; Eunapius, *Vitae philosophorum* (Oribasius), 499. "It is against the background of such testimonies that the reports concerning Asclepius must be considered."

² ACTA PAULI, I (HENNECKE, *Neutestam. Apokr.*, p. 197), the resurrection of the son of Anchares and Phila.

³ ACTA PAULI, 3 (HENNECKE, p. 204). Resurrection of Dion, who had lost his life in a fall.

⁴ ACTA PAULI, 7 (HENNECKE, p. 206).

⁵ MARTYRIUM PAULI, 1 (HENNECKE, p. 209 f. Cf. Ac. 20 : 9 ff.).

⁶ HENNECKE, p. 227 f.

⁷ ACTA THOM., 30 (HENNECKE, p. 266 f.).

murdered his beloved because she, moved by Thomas' preaching, had wanted to call off the wedding, brought her to life again in the inn where she had been killed.¹ It is said of the apostle John that he resurrected a dead person in Ephesus.² A priest of Artemis, who had been killed when a temple collapsed, was raised by a kinsman of the victim at John's command. The priest of Artemis became a follower of Jesus.³ This happened in Ephesus, where John also brought back to life an old man who had been killed by his son.⁴ A dead man is also said to have been raised in the days of the apostle Philip.⁵ In connection with all these accounts attention should be paid to the remark which IRENAEUS addresses to the pagan magicians. Irenaeus contrasts their deeds with those of Jesus, who raised the dead, as did the apostles, by means of prayer.⁶ As proof that the dead were in fact raised, reference is made to the fact that the raised dead: "continued to live among us for many years."⁷ This therefore means that some of those raised would still have been alive in the days of Emperor Hadrian (117-138).

In later centuries resurrection of the dead by the saints likewise plays an important role. HERZOG speaks of belief in miracles of resurrection which finds "completely unchecked" expression in the miracle books. This may be illustrated by an example. Immediately after the death of Saint Elizabeth on 16 November, 1231, a hundred

¹ ACTA THOM., 51 ff. (HENNECKE, p. 270 f.).

² EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., V, XVIII, 14.

³ ACTA JOH., 46 f. (HENNECKE, p. 180).

⁴ ACTA JOH., 48 ff. (HENNECKE, p. 180).

⁵ EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., III, XXXIX, 8, 9. Eusebius takes his account from Papias, who is said to have known John and Polycarp . . . Philip of Side (ca. 430), who also invokes Papias, tells inter alia of the resurrection from the dead of Manaimus' mother (see Manaen, Ac. 13 : 1). HENNECKE, p. 129.

⁶ IRENAEUS, Adv. haereses, II, 31, 2. EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., V, VII, 2, apparently considers this remark by Irenaeus so important that he reproduces it: "They [the heretics] do not have that power to raise the dead as the Lord resurrected them and also the apostles did by their prayer and, as more than once happened in the community, in a serious case an entire local church, fasting and offering many prayers, pleaded, and the spirit of the departed returned and that man rejoiced at the prayers of the saints."

⁷ IRENAEUS, Adv. haereses, II, 32, 4: "Iam etiam, quemadmodum diximus, et mortui resurrexerunt et perseveraverunt nobiscum annis multis." EUSEBIUS, Hist. eccles., IV, III, 2. For the text see the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment. . . In a legend handed down about Pilate we find a strange prayer: "Und keineswegs leugne ich deine Auferstehung, o mein Herr. Ich glaube vielmehr an dein Wort und an deine mächtigen Taten, welche du getan hast unter ihnen. Als du am Leben warst, da erwecktest du viele Tote." C. Clemen in Studien und Kritiken, 1894, p. 757 ff.; see BAUER, Das Leben Jesu, p. 364, note 4.

miracles are said to have happened at her grave, including nine resurrections. They were approved by the Pope.¹

In all these accounts, Biblical, Jewish, Christian and pagan, the reality of the resurrections is vouched for. How must they be interpreted nowadays? All the accounts can be treated in the same way and described as products of popular belief or of pious priestly deceit. A dividing line can also be drawn between the Biblical and the non-Biblical stories, and then critical lines can again be drawn in the Biblical data. However interesting a further examination of all these accounts may be, we should confine ourselves here to the Biblical accounts, and specifically to those in the Gospels. And in that case the question which arises in assessing these accounts is whether the Gospels are also considered to be historically reliable in accounts of this kind, and this "considering" is ultimately determined by faith. Under the influence of rationalism in particular, repeated attempts have been made to strip the miracles of Jesus of their unique nature. The data of the Old Testament have been quoted and the miracles have been imputed to the desire of the early Christians to glorify Jesus as the Messiah, who had to work miracles. They are therefore myths.² Others have associated them with the pagan miracle tales. And then we encounter all kinds of attempts to reduce the resurrections performed by Jesus to the revival of persons in a state of suspended animation. Not only is it said that Jairus' daughter and the young man at Nain were only cases of suspended

¹ HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 143 . . . Cf. WHITE, *Histoire de la Lutte entre la Science et la Theologie*, p. 291 f., for the resurrections by Francis Xavier . . . HANAUER, *Folklore of the Holy Land*, p. 99 f., tells how the rabbinical writer Kolonimos, who at the beginning of the eighteenth century was the head of the oppressed Jewish community in Jerusalem, once resurrected a dead man. A Mohammedan boy had been killed in the Jewish quarter on a Sabbath. Rabbi Kolonimos was brought before the Pasha, who threatened to wipe out the Jews if the murderer was not found. The rabbi wrote the tetragram, the name of the Almighty, on a piece of paper and, whilst it was still wet, laid it on the lips and the forehead of the murdered boy. The latter stood up, seized one of the bystanders by the throat and cried: This man, and no other, is guilty of shedding my blood. The murderer proved to be a Mohammedan. The rabbi performed a severe penance, since in his opinion he had desecrated the Sabbath.

² STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 172 ff. Strauss points to the climax in the accounts: deathbed (Jairus' daughter)—bier (young man at Nain)—grave (Lazarus); see p. 156 . . . ROBERTSON, *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 360: "The raising of the Widow's Son at Nain . . . is in all probability a variant of the common myth of the raising of the slain young Sun-God, reduced to the status of a private prodigy, as in the myths of Elija and Elisha" (cf. p. 258 ff.).

animation,¹ but this is also supposed of Lazarus.² However, a striking thing is that various scholars prefer to observe a certain caution, so that the word "probably" flows steadily from their pens as a kind of pet expression! Without doubt the "suspended animation" theory can claim support from the fact that in those days, as a result of lack of medical training, people could easily make mistakes in establishing death, whilst the Oriental custom of early burial helped to conceal these mistakes.³ KORY states how among some primitive peoples persons who have lost consciousness are regarded as dead and treated accordingly.⁴

VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN wishes to direct attention to the explanation put forward from the side of parapsychology. He points for instance to the view held by Dr. Boland, who believes that Christ, Jairus and the child formed a community of spirit, making it possible to prevent the death of the child. He goes on: "Occultism also gives the following picture of death: firstly an astral body frees itself from the physical body; a period then ensues in which the two are still linked by a fluid. As long as this is so, and that bond is not broken, the astral phenomenon can still return into the physical

¹ PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, pp. 526, 720. VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 414. WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, Fifth Discourse, p. (27). SCHLEIERMACHER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 233. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 271. MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, pp. 342, 366. FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 64: "So muss auch bei der Jairus-tochter, dem Jüngling von Nain und Tabitha mit der Möglichkeit des Vorhandenseins eines todesähnlichen Zustandes gerechnet werden." SENG, *Die Heilungen Jesu in mediz. Beleuchtung*, p. 21: "Die Sache wird wohl so gewesen sein, dass die Umgebung an den Betreffenden kein Lebenszeichen mehr wahrgenommen hat und daraus schloss, sie seien gestorben. Eine genaue Untersuchung mit Mitteln, wie wir sie heute anwenden zur Konstatierung des Todes, ist sicherlich nicht erfolgt." TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.*, p. 43; EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament u. im Talmud*, p. 106, re Mt. 9 : 18 and Lk. 7 : 11 ff. "Es handelte sich in den beiden hier mitgeteilten Fällen um Menschen, welche man für tot hielt . . . Freilich haben die neutestamentlichen Fälle in der Art ihrer Darstellung etwas, was mehr an Legenden als an sächliche Vorkommnisse erinnert." SCHÄFER, *Jesus in psychiatrischer Beleuchtung*, p. 63.

² PAULUS, *Commentar über das N.T.*, IV, 1, p. 543 ff. DE RÉGLA, *Jésus de Nazareth*, p. 251. SCHÄFER, *op. cit.*, p. 63; catalepsy must be envisaged in all three cases: Jairus' daughter, the young man at Nain and Lazarus.

³ PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 532 f., note 1, mentions a number of cases . . . PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*. "Über die Zeichen, die man als den eingetretenen Tod beweisend annahm, finde ich keine Angaben" (p. 601).

⁴ KORY, *Die Behandlung der Alten u. Kranken b. d. Naturvölker*, p. 327 ff. "Ein Mann, der während einer schweren Krankheit für etwa zwölf Stunden bewusstlos war und dann wieder zu sich gekommen war, galt als von dem Tod auferstanden" (p. 327, note 106).

body." That could have been the case with Jairus' daughter and probably also with the young man at Nain, in whom Jesus reversed the process of death and obviated the danger of a man in suspended animation being buried.¹ However, such an opinion finds favour only if one shares the philosophy of the occultists.

Attempts have thus been made to explain the raising of the dead by Jesus in various ways: as myths to add lustre to Jesus' Messiahship, with reference to Old Testament data; as legends and analogies of the pagan miracle tales; in a naturalistic sense by explaining away the deaths as suspended animation; in allegorical fashion, as for instance WOOLSTON did; from the point of view of parapsychology. We have already remarked that whether the Gospels are regarded as historically reliable in accounts such as these depends ultimately on one's belief in the person of Jesus Christ as the Plenipotentiary of God. This does not mean to say that, for instance as regards Jairus' daughter, one cannot envisage a case of suspended animation, but that in the raising of Lazarus there is an "either. . . or." Either it is believed that John handed down the resurrection of Lazarus as a reliable account, or it is not believed, whatever fine and spiritual reflections may otherwise be attached to the story.

It is evident from the message of the Gospels that the resurrections may not be regarded as isolated facts, but that they have their place, significance and importance in the whole of Christ's words and work. Jesus Christ is the Life, and He brings life: the resurrections are signs in which the conquering power of the Messianic Kingdom is manifest and by which it is proclaimed to the world that God is a living God, in whose name the Son testifies and acts.²

¹ VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *Parapsychologie en Godsdienstig leven*, p. 75 ff. . . . For the resurrection of Jesus Christ see G. ZORAB, *Het opstandingsverhaal in het licht der Parapsychologie*, 1949.

² OEPKE, TWNT, I, p. 371: "Die Erweckungen sind Zeichen der messianischen Zeit und deshalb nicht isolierte Mirakel (Mt 11, 5; J 11, 25.26, vgl 5, 20 f.; 6, 39.40.44.54). Auch Mt 27, 53 gehört hierher." Cf. also G. SEVENSTER, *De Christologie v.h. N.T.*, p. 30 ff. STAUFFER, *Theologie des Neuen Testamentes*, p. 106, strikingly calls Christ the "heilgeschichtliche Lebensträger" . . . GÖDAN, Dr. med. and Lic. theol., stresses in his "Christus und Hippokrates" that death is "Gottes Feind," see 1 Co. 15 : 26. The text may not be restricted to a "geistige Überwindung" (p. 112). Death does not form part of the creation (p. 119). "Der Tod ist Gottes Feind, nicht sein Bote, nicht Erlöser. Das wollen wir festhalten" (p. 130). Gödan rightly comments: "Jesu Wunder der Totenauferweckung werden oft als theologische Belastung empfunden. Andere sehen in ihnen alte fromme Mythen, die uns nichts mehr zu sagen haben. In Wirklichkeit bedeuten jene Berichte eine Befreiung. Hier wollen uns die Berichterstatte das richtige

(b) *Jairus' daughter*

The account of the resurrection of Jairus' daughter is the only one of this kind which the Synoptists have in common.¹ Matthew is again fairly brief here. ALLEN thinks that Matthew wrote down what he remembered.² In Mark and Luke the account follows immediately on that of the healing of the demoniac in the country of the Gadarenes, whereas Matthew interpolates other material between these two stories. Matthew begins his account with: "While he spake these things unto them" — that is the discussion with the disciples of John regarding fasting, 9 : 14-17 — and Mark speaks of Jesus' journey across the Sea of Galilee "unto the other side," 5 : 21. "The other side" generally means the eastern shore, but here it is the western shore, where Capernaum lies.³ Matthew calls the man a "ruler."⁴ Mark speaks of "one of the rulers of the synagogue, Jairus by name," whilst Luke likewise mentions the name.⁵ According to Matthew the father came to beg Jesus' pity and fell down before Him. His daughter was "even now dead." Mark has the man say: "My little daughter lieth at the point of death." In Luke his only daughter, about twelve years of age, "lay a-dying." Ac-

Denken gegenüber dem Tod demonstrieren. Hier ist das Rückgrat des Arztiums. Nicht wir brauchen Jesu Wunder zu verteidigen, sie verteidigen uns, unser Leben" (p. 112).

¹ Mt. 9 : 18-26; Mk. 5 : 22-43; Lk. 8 : 41-56. According to GOPPELT, *Typos*, p. 83, this account contains: "keinen Hinweis auf die beiden atl Erweckungsgeschichten."

² ALLEN, *St. Matthew*. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, classifies the account among the "Novellen." For a further analysis see PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 38 f.; BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 228 ff., regarding the blending of two originally isolated miracle stories. It is one of the "Wundergeschichten."

³ Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*; DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 149 ff. SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 144, thinks it was the eastern shore. "Ebensogut wie in Kapernaum können wir auch etwa in Bethsaida am Nördlichen Ostufer des Sees das Haus des Jairus suchen."

⁴ According to SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, II, p. 439, εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων Mk. 5 : 22, means someone who belongs to this class, so that εἷς must not be interpreted as a numeral. The ruler of the synagogue had the task of ensuring that services ran smoothly; he had nothing to do with running the community in general. See also SCHRAGE, *TWNT*, VII, p. 842 ff.

⁵ The name Jair, יֵאִיר, occurs in Numbers 32 : 41, Judges 10 : 3-5 and Esther 2 : 5, and means: "He (God) enlightens;" cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 9; KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*. HAUCK, *Markus*, points to the possible derivation from the Hebrew word "to awaken," and says: "Möglicherweise könnte letztere Bedeutung eine symbolische Beziehung auf die Geschichte erhalten." Cf. also CHAJES, *Markus-Studien*, p. 38.

according to Mark and Luke the father thus thought of healing and not of raising from the dead. PAULUS suspects that Jesus was acquainted with Jairus and his daughter, a possibility which of course always remains open.¹ Jesus then set out with His disciples — according to Mark and Luke surrounded by a large multitude — for Jairus' house. A temporary hold-up — the healing of the woman with an issue — proved disastrous for the dying girl. En route Jairus received the message that his child had meanwhile died and that he must not trouble the Master any further, Mark 5 : 35, Luke 8 : 49. But Jesus did not listen to what was said, heartened the father and, when He had reached Jairus' house, permitted only His intimates Peter, James and John to enter the house with Him.² The preparations for the funeral had already been made: the minstrels and the professional mourners were performing their duties.³ This illustrates how quickly action was taken; the first part of the mourning ceremony had already begun.⁴ Jesus put a stop to these lamentations by saying: "Why make ye this ado, and weep? the damsel is not dead, but sleepeth," Mk. 5 : 39. Matthew has: "Give place: for the maid is not dead, but sleepeth," 9 : 24. Luke's version is: "Weep not; she is not dead, but sleepeth," 8 : 52. The Synoptists thus agree with each other in their statement that Jesus spoke of "sleep." What did He mean? The word used here occurs in the New Testament in three different meanings: it means sleep in the literal sense;⁵

¹ PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 523.

² Mk. 5 : 37; Lk. 8 : 51, where the father and mother are also mentioned. Luke is referring here to entering the death-chamber; Mark twice reports that people were turned out, Mk. 5 : 37, 40. These details do not appear in Matthew.

³ Mt. 9 : 23, Mk. 5 : 38, Lk. 8 : 52. The lamentations consisted of choral song or antiphony, accompanied by hand-clapping. See STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, 521 ff. Even the poorest man might be obliged to hire at least two flute-players and one professional mourner for his wife's funeral . . . Cf. the vivid description given by L. BAUER, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*, p. 211 ff. The women stand in a circle, surrounding the leader of the dance, and dance rhythmically from left to right with their hair hanging down. "Allmählich steigern sich die leidenschaftlichen Klagen und die wilden Bewegungen der Hände und Füße, bis die Gesichter in hohem Masse gerötet und erregt aussehen und die Zeit des Begräbnisses heranrückt. Ein solches Getümmel fand Jesus bei Jairus Töchterlein vor (Mk 5, 38)."

⁴ STÄHLIN, TWNT, III, p. 843, points out that in the case of Jairus' daughter we are concerned with the : "erste Abschnitt der Totenklage," and as regards Lazarus with the second.

⁵ καθεύδω sleep, in Mt. 8 : 24; 13 : 25; 25 : 5; 26 : 40, 43, 45; Mk. 4 : 27, 38; 13 : 36; 14 : 37, 40, 41; Lk. 22 : 46; 1 Thess. 5 : 7.

sleep in the figurative sense; ¹ and sleep in the sense of being dead ². The last meaning is assumed by those who maintain that this is a case of resurrection. CALVIN argues that sleep is occasionally used in the Bible for death, and does not doubt that by this comparison with sleep the future resurrection is designated. ³ GREYDANUS remarks that by the use of the word "sleep" Jesus doubtless means: "that she had not died for good, for ever, until the day of judgment, cf. verse 55, but would live again at once, cf. Jn. 11 : 11." ⁴ KEULERS recalls the expression "sleep the last sleep" for death. ⁵ For OEPKE there is no doubt that the Evangelists wished to report a resurrection from death. ⁶ But what about Jesus' express assurance that the girl was "not dead?" It seems to us that with so clear a text before us we should not try to amplify Jesus' deed; the obvious explanation is that Jesus aroused the apparently dead girl from a state of deep unconsciousness, suspended animation or whatever else it may be called. It must not be thought that the miracle of resurrection is then reduced to a case in which Jesus' special knowledge is demonstrated.

¹ 1 Thess. 5 : 6.

² 1 Thess. 5 : 10.

³ CALVIN, Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas, re Mk. 5 : 39: "Dormire passim accipitur in Scriptura pro mori: nec dubium est quin hac similitudine a temporali quiete sumpta notetur futura resurrectio."

⁴ GREYDANUS, Lukas.

⁵ KEULERS, Mattheüs. "Jesus rightly calls her death a sleep, because she will soon awake from it." He refers to Mt. 27 : 52; Jn. 11 : 11; Ac. 7 : 60; 1 Co. 7 : 39; 11 : 30; 15 : 6. See also VAN LEEUWEN, Markus; GOULD, St. Mark. TRENCH, Notes on the Miracles, p. 184. The girl was not in "a death-like swoon" but had died. It was called "only sleeping because her awakening was so near." PLUMMER, St. Luke, hesitates. We must regard this case in the light of Jn. 11 : 11. "We may, however, be content, with Hase, to admit that certainty is unattainable as to whether the maiden was dead or in a trance." KRAUSS, The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VII, art. Jesus of Nazareth, p. 162, comments that Jesus: "himself occasionally deprecated the exaggeration to which such cures naturally led." For instance, Jesus "expressly" stated that the girl slept. "Notwithstanding this, her resuscitation was regarded as a miracle." WEATHERHEAD, Psychology, Religion and Healing, p. 74, thinks that a resurrection from the dead must not be envisaged here. HUNTER, The Work and Words of Jesus, p. 58, envisages "a case of coma." TAYLOR, The Life and Ministry of Jesus, p. 103, considers the best explanation: "the view that the girl was aroused from a state of trance or coma."

⁶ OEPKE, TWNT, III, p. 440: "Es ist aber auch fraglich, ob das Herrnwort, wenn es authentisch ist, ursprünglich anders gemeint war. Von antiken Voraussetzungen aus ist der Sinn am ehesten dahin zu bestimmen, dass die Seele des Mädchleins zwar den Körper verlassen hat, sich aber noch in der Nähe desselben aufhält und deshalb durch ein Machtwort Jesu in der Kraft Gottes zurückgerufen werden soll. Dass der Tod im allgemeinen nur ein Schlaf sei, will das Wort nicht sagen."

No, Jesus demonstrates His mercy to the girl at a highly critical moment and heals her.

Nothing is said about the girl's symptoms. VON AMMON thinks of a cataleptic state connected with the girl's development into a woman.¹ Jesus' words are answered by scornful laughter from the bystanders: "knowing that she was dead," Luke 8 : 53. The fact that tears could so easily change to laughter proves how conventional the mourning customs were.² As this laughter of those present, and particularly of the professional mourners, and their "knowing" that the girl was dead are also adduced as arguments that this was in fact a resurrection from death, it should be countered that medical knowledge was very imperfect, and mistakes were anything but out of the question. Similar scorn at and opposition to those who held another view is also mentioned in the miracle stories of Epidaurus, whilst KOTY recounts a similar story about primitive peoples. An old woman became unconscious, and her children wished to bury her. "The missionary intervened and tried to convince them that the old woman was still alive, that she was still breathing. However, the family was of a different opinion. She was already dead, because her throat and her head were 'dead,' and as such she was 'tabu' and had to be buried."³ Matthew briefly tells that the multitude were driven out, after which Jesus went inside and took the girl by the hand, whereupon she arose, Mt. 9 : 25. Matthew thus only mentions the touch.⁴ Mark relates that Jesus, with the parents and three disciples, entered the room where the girl lay, took the

¹ VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 417: "Niemand kann das läugnen, und noch viel weniger hat Jemand das Recht, dem Andern zu verbieten, dass er sich hierbei an solche Übergänge der kämpfenden Natur erinnere."

² Cf. STÄHLIN, *TWNT*, III, p. 843 f. See for instance the difference between Jn. 11 : 37 and v. 46.

³ KOTY, *Die Behandlung der Alten u. Kranken b. d. Naturvölkern*, p. 328. The account is taken from G. Brown, *Melanesians and Polynesians*, London, 1910. . . . RENGSTORF, *TWNT*, I, p. 657 f., says that what is meant here is: "das höhnische Gelächter, das aus dem Besserwissen und damit aus der Überlegenheit über Jesus kommt." HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidaurus*, on the unbelief and mockery of some in Epidaurus. A man did not believe that Aesculapius could heal his bent fingers. He was healed, but his name henceforth was to be "Apistos," the unbeliever (p. 9 ff., miracle 3). Ambrosia of Athens, who had laughed at the healings of Epidaurus, was nevertheless healed of her blindness in one eye (p. 11, miracle 4). N.N., blind in one eye, was mocked at by the bystanders because he believed in the possibility of healing (p. 13, miracle 9).

⁴ See the chapter: Jesus' Methods of Treatment.

child by the hand and said: "Talitha cumi." Luke likewise reports that Jesus took her by the hand and adds that He said: "Maid, arise." Mark handed down Jesus' words of resurrection in Aramaic, and added the translation.¹ The view held by BULTMANN that Mark did this because the miracle-workers often used barbarisms to lend force to their spells, so that this is a facet of the miracle style, is just as untenable as DIBELIUS' view that the author had a practical aim, viz. to supply Christian healers with certain verbal prescriptions in the original language.² For this is not the only occasion on which Mark gives Aramaic words with a translation,³ so that we are more likely to be concerned here with Palestinian memories than with barbarisms, as SCHNIEWIND rightly remarks.⁴

Mark and Luke add a number of details. According to Mark the girl stood up at once and was able to walk, for she was twelve years of age and thus already a "young daughter," according to the Jewish classification of female ages.⁵ More than all the others, Luke pays attention to the recovery as such: "her spirit came again," which indicates medical interest. It does not necessarily mean that the Evangelist here is referring to the return of the spirit to a dead body, as PLUMMER thinks he is, but it points to the restoration of vital forces through the touch and the word of Jesus.⁶

¹ Mk. 5 : 41, $\tau\alpha\lambda\iota\theta\acute{\alpha}\ \kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\iota$. Some mss. τ . $\kappa\omicron\upsilon\mu\iota$. $\tau\alpha\lambda\iota\theta\acute{\alpha}$ is Aramaic: טַלִּיתָא קֻמִּי , טַלִּיתָא קֻמִּי , Aramaic, קֻמִּי , arise. See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 10. . . BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 251, remarks with regard to Jesus' words: "Also: die Realität des in seinem Erbarmen allmächtigen Gottes gegen die manifeste Realität des Todes!"

² BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 238. DIBELIUS, Die Formgeschichte, p. 81: "Wenn also die christlichen Erzähler Wert legen auf die Mitteilung der Formeln in der Originalsprache, so haben sie offenbar eine praktische Absicht." ORIGEN, c. Celsum, I, 24, and V, 45, cannot serve as references.

³ Cf. Mk. 3 : 17, Boanerges; 7 : 11, Corban; 10 : 46, Bartimaeus; 14 : 36, Abba. Nor must 7 : 34, Ephphatha, be regarded as a barbarism.

⁴ Cf. SCHNIEWIND, NTD, I, 1, Markus u. Matthäus, p. 86. KITTEL, TWNT, IV, p. 107: these words have never been used as magic spells.

⁵ Up to the age of 11 years and one day a girl was regarded as a "child," תִּינוּקָה ; from 11 years and one day to 12 years and one day as "under age," קִטְנָה ; from 12 to $12\frac{1}{2}$ years as a "young daughter," נַעֲרָה , and from $12\frac{1}{2}$ years as "adult," בְּנוּרָה . See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 10. According to CHAJES, Markus-Studien, p. 37 f., the number twelve in Mk. 5 : 42 bears: "den Stempel der Genauigkeit;" the Hebrew text doubtless had נַעֲרָה .

⁶ PLUMMER, St. Luke. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\epsilon\psi\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, Lk. 8 : 55. "There can be no doubt that the Evangelist uses the phrase of the spirit returning to a

Mark and Luke mention Jesus' instructions to give the girl something to eat. Must this point to the reality of the miracle,¹ or was this command by Jesus inspired by "goodness pure and simple?" This is how KEULERS interprets it. "It is such a fine human touch that Jesus, in the midst of the general tumult, realized that the girl would need food."² After relating the astonishment of the parents, Mark and Luke are again the only ones to report Jesus' express ban on making this deed known.³ However, Matthew says that the fame of this feat spread throughout the whole of that region. The various details, particularly in Mark and Luke, the name Jairus, the mentioning of the age, the "only child,"⁴ the scornful laughter, the order to give the child something to eat, all these indicate fixed aspects of the tradition and can hardly be ascribed en masse to the miracle style, although it must be admitted that they offer no objective proof of the event's historicity.⁵

BORNHÄUSER presumes that the Gospel of Matthew, which was written in Aramaic, could have been read in Capernaum before 70 A.D., and in that year Jairus' daughter was about forty-seven years old. "Just imagine," says BORNHÄUSER, "that all this would have been read in Capernaum, where a large number of people who 35 years before were already adults were still alive." What would they have said if the miracle had not happened?⁶

dead body, which is the accurate use of the phrase. Only the beloved physician makes this statement." In Judges 15 : 19 and 1 Sa. 30 : 12, which texts Plummer mentions, reference is not made to the dead but to living persons whose forces revived. GREYDANUS, Lukas: "Inherent in this is that her spirit had departed, and that she therefore was not in a state of suspended animation, but really dead."

¹ DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 76, points to the: "Erzählungsstil, der durch das mitgeteilte Wunder an sich missionarisch wirken will: denn so konstatiert man die Realität des Wunders." He refers to the story of a healing at Lourdes in 1932, reported in *L'Écho de Paris*, 23 August, 1932, which concludes as follows: "on l'a conduit devant la grotte, où un bien-être mystérieux l'envahit aussitôt. Elle est guérie et, de retour à l'hôpital, demande à manger." "Die Fähigkeit zu essen, bezeugt auch hier die wiedergewonnene Lebenskraft." Cf. p. 84. . . See HAUCK, *Markus*. ² KEULERS, *Markus en Lucas*.

³ See the chapter: *The Healing of the Possessed*.

⁴ Lk. 8 : 42; cf. 9 : 38. HENNECKE, *Neutestam. Apokr.*, p. 227, in the account of the resurrection of a gardener's "only" daughter by Peter.

⁵ DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 99: "Das oft ausgesprochene Urteil dass farbenreiche Erzählungen nicht erfunden sein könnten, beruht auf einer Verwechslung von Realismus und Wirklichkeitstreue. Der farbige Realismus der Novellen entspricht nicht den Bedürfnissen der Predigt, sondern den Erwartungen von Menschen, die an ähnliche Geschichten von Wundertätern, Propheten, Lehrern gewöhnt waren." Cf. DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*.

⁶ BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 53.

Reflections such as these may be regarded as curious speculations rather than as arguments, since the whole is shrouded in a cloud of stipulations. The resurrection of Jairus' daughter is both a deed of compassion and a sign of the conquering power of Jesus Christ over the forces of disease and darkness, in which the Kingdom of God was manifest as a saving reality.

(c) *The young man at Nain*

This story is told only by Luke, 7 : 11-17.¹ It seems as if the miracle stories have been arranged to lead to a climax: first the healing of the centurion's servant at Capernaum and then the resurrection of the young man at Nain, to serve as a reference for the message for John that "the dead are raised," 7 : 22. But why does Luke not recount the resurrection of Jairus' daughter until later?² Luke tells that "the day after" Jesus was on His way with His disciples and a large multitude to the town of Nain. The name of this place — Nain means "charming" — is still to be found in that of the present village Nen, over two hours' walk south-east from Nazareth and about an hour's walk to the west of Endor.³

Near the town gate Jesus met a funeral procession: the only son of a widow was being taken to his grave.⁴

In front of the bier walked the friends of the young man, mourning their dead friend.⁵ The "Lord" — this title is used by Luke here

¹ According to DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 71 f., this is a "Novelle" with a missionary motif. PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 40, points out that only Jesus takes action: (a) he consoles the mother: (b) stops the procession: (c) speaks the resurrecting words (climax). BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 230, sees in the account a "Wundergeschichte," viz.: "den hellenistischen Typus des Erweckungswunders."

² Lk. 8 : 40-56. Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*.

³ This Nain (Naim, נַיִם) is therefore not the same as that mentioned by FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *De bello Jud.*, IV, IX, 4, which lay east of the Jordan . . . Tradition later identified the grave meant for the young man, whilst his mother's house was changed into a church. The Franciscans now have a chapel there. Cf. DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 206 f.; STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 161; SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 114 f.; KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 294 ff. The view that Nain means "the resurrected one" (according to Nestle) is rejected by SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, and HAUCK, *Lukas*.

⁴ Only son, μονογενής, ὁ υἱός, cf. Judges 11 : 34; Amos 8 : 10; Zechariah 12 : 10; Luke 8 : 42; 9 : 38 . . . GREYDANUS, *Lukas*, remarks that Jesus knew when He had to leave Capernaum and how quickly or slowly He had to travel to arrive at the town gate at that precise moment. A far-fetched explanation!

⁵ Cf. DALMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 207; in Galilee the mourners walked in front of the

for the first time — took pity on the mother and said to her: “Weep not.” This was Jesus’ first act: consoling and reassuring the mother, as a result of which He immediately dominated the situation. Approaching, He touched the bier and caused the funeral procession to stop. Jesus thus had no fear of impurifying Himself ritually. It was not the touching of the bier that brought the dead man to life again,¹ but the command which then followed: “Young man, I say unto thee, Arise.” The literal translation is: “Unto thee I say, Arise!” The young man sat up — Luke here uses a medical term which applies to the sitting up of sick persons in bed — and began to speak.² Now is this a case of suspended animation, as many think? Was there “somewhat more of the appearance of Death in him, than in Jairus’s Daughter,” as WOOLSTON says, or may there perhaps — again according to this author — have been a fraudulent conspiracy between the young man, his mother and others, so that Jesus could demonstrate a miracle? WOOLSTON adds the hope that God might forgive him for such thoughts, but the possibility exists! For if Jesus had really wanted to perform a resurrection, why did He not wait until a few weeks after the burial?³ PAULUS believes that Jesus’ command to the young man shows that He had probably seen him move in his state of suspended animation.⁴ Medically it

bier, in Judea behind it. According to EDERSHEIM, I, p. 555 f., the women walked in front of the bier and relatives and friends behind it . . . The body lay on an open bier, *πῦρ*, borne by neighbours. See EDERSHEIM, op. cit.; PLUMMER, St. Luke; HAUCK, Lukas. According to BISHOP, Jesus of Palestine, the women nowadays walk behind. “When women go to funerals, they are usually behind, even if chief mourners. In this case she would be supported by women friends” (p. 112).

¹ GODET, Lukas, rightly opposes the sarcastic comment by KEIM: “The faith powerful enough to penetrate the wood of the coffin is that of the Evangelist, not ours.”

² νεανίσκε, σοι λέγω, ἐγέρθητι· καὶ ἀνεκάθισεν ὁ νεκρὸς καὶ ἤρξατο λαλεῖν. Lk. 7 : 14, 15 . . . ἀνακαθίζω, cf. Ac. 9 : 40, in “medical writers, who often use it of sick persons sitting up in bed (Hobart, p. 11),” according to PLUMMER, St. Luke.

³ WOOLSTON, Discourses on the Miracles, Fifth Discourse, p. (28) f.

⁴ PAULUS, Exegetisches Handbuch, I, 2, p. 720: “Führt nicht die Anrede Jesu ‘Jüngling, dir sage ich’ auf die Voraussetzung, Jesus habe, da er in die Bahre blickte, den Jüngling so, dass man einen Zuruf an ihn richten *konnte*, also in einiger Bewegung, kurz so, wie bei den scheinbar Todten, das erste Zurückkommen zu sinnlichen Äusserungen sich zu zeigen pflegt, gesehen? Dies mag ein jeder nach seinem Massstab von Wahrscheinlichkeit ermessen” . . . TAYLOR, The Life and Ministry of Jesus, p. 103, note 3, thinks that this “may be a case of premature burial” . . . Cf. the account of the resurrection of a bride, Vita Apoll., IV, 45. Apollonius, too, had the bier stopped. The writer asks himself

is not impossible that animation was suspended, but Luke reports in express terms the resurrection of a dead man. F. BARTH correctly remarks that it would really be most peculiar if Jesus had always been concerned with cases of suspended animation, and that this story does not look as if it relates to such a case.¹ If it had been so, the resurrection would have been more like an exhibition than a display of power and mercy. After the young man had been restored to life, Jesus gave him to his mother. The surmise that he was his mother's sole support has rather a western tinge to it because of this idea of bread-winning.² The bystanders, who at first had been seized by fear, began to glorify God. They praised Jesus as a "great prophet" and gave glory to God, who had visited His people.³ Thoughts of prophets such as Moses, Elijah and Elisha stirred the minds of those present, and "throughout all Judaea, and throughout all the region round about" the word went around about the startling feat of Jesus of Nazareth.

To explain this story reference is readily made to the resurrections performed by Elijah and Elisha, and it is then recalled that Nain and Sunem, where Elisha resurrected an only son, were close together,⁴ or the type of the pagan resurrection miracles is pointed to.⁵ However, a more detailed comparison shows that there are

"whether he had discerned in her a spark of life which had been hidden from her physicians" . . . For the full text see the introduction to this chapter.

¹ F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 134. RENGSTORF, NTD, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, p. 85: it is foolish to regard this as suspended animation. "So etwas hätten die ersten Christen schwerlich zu unserem Bericht gemacht." Jesus is: "dem Tode nicht wahllos entgegengetreten, sondern da, wo sein Regiment sinnlos erschien."

² According to GREYDANUS, *Lukas*.

³ Cf. Lk. 1 : 68, 78; Ac. 15 : 14 . . . BARTH, K.D., III, 2, p. 72: "Und so sind auch die Zeugen der Auferweckung des Jünglings von Nain (Luk. 7, 16) auf der rechten Spur, wenn sie — ἐλαβεν δὲ φόβος πάντας — Gott die Ehre gaben unter dem Eindruck, dass ein grosser Prophet unter ihnen aufgestanden sei, mehr noch: dass Gott sein Volk heimgesucht habe." Cf. IV, 2, p. 204. BEYER, TWNT, II, p. 601.

⁴ 1 Ki. 17 : 8-24; 2 Ki. 4 : 8-37 . . . STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 172 ff. The resurrections are myths; they were after all expected of the Messiah. GOPPELT, *Typos*, p. 82: this story points clearly to Old Testament parallels. GILS, *Jésus Prophète*, p. 26: "A travers toute la scène, nous apercevons en filigrane le récit du Livre des Rois où Elie rend la vie au fils unique de la veuve de Sarepta (Lc., 7, 11-17 = 1 Reg., 17, 8-24)." Cf. p. 43; there is a "contact littéraire."

⁵ See the introduction to this chapter . . . Views such as that of Loisy, viz. that Jerusalem is depicted here as the mother mourning the end of her only son Israel, who was, however, resurrected by Jesus, cast us into the immeasurable sea of allegory. Cf. KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas*; KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukas-*

so many striking differences that the story of the young man of Nain can hardly be denied its unique nature. When STRAUSS points to the restoration of the son to the mother by both Elijah and Jesus, one is inclined to ask what else these two could have done! The similarity is a result of the situation and has nothing to do with derivation. CALVIN spiritualizes the event too greatly when he says that this young man "is an image of the spiritual life which he [Christ] restores to us."¹ For we must not in the first place regard this miracle which Jesus performed unasked, and without demanding faith, as a sign of His power or as a sign for our spiritual life, but as a deed of immediate mercy by the Saviour, whose heart went out to men in their distress and sorrow.

(d) *The resurrection of Lazarus*

Around the resurrection of Lazarus the critics are ranked in battle array, like an army round a beleaguered fortress. It is impossible to deal with every aspect of the criticism directed against Jn. 11 : 1-44, but a brief survey clearly illustrates how greatly the opinions differ. It is thus a far from united army that surrounds the fortress. The fact that the Synoptists do not report this miracle seems to many to be reason enough to doubt its factuality. Moreover, there is the still unanswered question of the outlook and the purpose of the fourth Evangelist. Some think that the historical form of the miracle story serves only to illustrate the idea that Jesus is the Life and the Giver of life. It is believed that the discussion which Jesus had with Martha and Mary was expanded into a miracle story. Or it is considered that the story is a composite one, made up from what Luke tells about Martha and Mary and the parable of the beggar Lazarus.² In any case, it is thought, the solution must be sought

evangelium. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 230, calls almost every feature of the account "typisch," and says: "Die verschiedenen genannten Momente machen hellenistisches Judentum als den Ursprungsort der gewiss ziemlich sekundären Bildung wahrscheinlich." The fact that the son is the "only" son is described by Bultmann as a: "typisch legendarischer Zug," p. 340.

¹ CALVIN, *op. cit.* Re Lk. 7 : 11: "... sciamus iuvenem hunc quem Christus a morte suscitavit, speciem esse spiritualis vitae quam nobis restituit."

² Luke 10 : 38-42; 16 : 19-31 . . . In what way did John make the poor Lazarus the brother of the well-to-do Mary and Martha? See the explanation in KEULERS, *Joannes* . . . W. B. SMITH, *Ecce Deus*, p. 30. The account of Lazarus derives "deutlich" from the parable of Lk. 16 : 19-31. Lazarus and Mary are symbols of the pagan world (p. 110). BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 302,

in symbolism and not in history. STRAUSS explains the story as a myth, referring to 2 Ki. 13 : 21,¹ whilst various rationalists do their utmost to make of Lazarus a case of suspended animation all the same.

Without doubt, the silence of the Synoptists is a difficult point. But we should remember that the miracle at Nain is handed down only by Luke. KEULERS is right when he says that the critics would also deny the fact of Lazarus' resurrection if it were related unanimously by the four Evangelists.² But this does not solve the difficulty. The view that the Synoptists suppressed the account so as not to endanger Lazarus' family is untenable.³ This is so firstly because we still do not know the dating of the Gospels; secondly because it is questionable whether Lazarus and his sisters would still have been alive; thirdly because it is questionable whether the Jews would at that time still have sought Lazarus' life, and fourthly because the Synoptists could also have handed down the account without mentioning names. The silence of the Synoptists is also ascribed by some to the fact that they are chiefly concerned with Jesus' activities in Galilee and district, or in other words in a limited area. They did not refer to the resurrection of Lazarus because they had already described other resurrections. Against this it may be argued that they could surely have fitted this so important deed by Jesus somewhere into the framework of their accounts.⁴ Whatever hypotheses

note 3: "Dass der Name Laz. aus Lk 16, 19-31 stamme . . . ist eine oft geäußerte Vermutung" . . . STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 223: אֱלֹהֵינוּ (= 'dem Gott hilft.' 'dessen Hilfe Gott ist'), imp T לְעֹרֵר; dieser Form entspricht Ἀάζαρος."

¹ STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 173 f.

² KEULERS, Joannes. BAUER, *Das Johannesevangelium*, believes that John read in a source unknown to the Synoptists about a resurrection by Jesus: "und diesen Bericht, die Einzelkeiten, so gut es ging, verwertend, ausgestaltet zu dem göttlichen Allmachtswunder, durch das Jesus erneut seine Herrlichkeit offenbart." Cf. BARRETT, St. John, who also puts forward the idea that we are perhaps concerned with a development from a parable. TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 103, note 2: "the historical basis of the didactic story of the raising of Lazarus is not known."

³ According to HERDER, *Von Gottes Sohn*, p. 327 f. John was able to give this account: "da zu dieser Zeit Jerusalem wahrscheinlich nicht mehr stand, und jene freundschaftliche Familie in Bethanien vielleicht schon bei ihrem Freunde in der andern Welt war." . . . "In einer Reihe von Leben-Jesu," says SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 35 f., "findet sich dann diese naivste der Erklärungen reproduziert." KEULERS, Joannes, also still attaches value to this argument.

⁴ WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, Fifth Discourse, (p. 6), remarks: "They could not forget it, nor be ignorant of it, if the Story had been really true;

are postulated, there are always objections that can be made to them, and a satisfactory solution has not been found so far. Will it ever be found? The difference between the Synoptists and the fourth Gospel as regards content, form and outlook is so great that it will always remain a source of discussion.

As regards the form of the account, DIBELIUS remarks that it has all the typical features of the secular "Novelle;" here the heightened Jesus speaks and acts as the Son of God and the tradition has passed into myth.¹

The resurrection of Lazarus: is it historical fact, myth, symbol or pious deceit by Martha and Mary to support Jesus, as RENAN supposes? The choice is a matter of personal belief.

The long-drawn-out story can be divided into various parts. In the first six verses the situation is outlined. One of the members of a family at Bethany who was friendly with Jesus, Lazarus, was sick. Bethany lay to the east of the Mount of Olives and a little to the west of the present-day village of el-Azarieh, i.e. Lazarus' place. As early as the fourth century a church stood on the site of Lazarus' grave.² John calls Bethany "the town of Mary and her sister Martha," from which it may be derived that these sisters were generally known. In Luke Martha, which means "mistress," is mentioned first; she is the hostess and takes the lead. John recalls the anointing of Jesus by Mary.³ The story creates the impression that both the sisters and the brother were unmarried. The sisters informed Jesus that Lazarus was sick. "Lord, behold, he whom thou lovest is sick." This message, in which a cordial mutual affection is expressed, cf. verse 5, contains an urgent request for Jesus to come quickly. Jesus' answer: "This

and to assign any other Reason than Ignorance or Forgetfulness, is hard and impossible."

¹ DIBELIUS, *Die Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, I, p. 74 ff.; idem, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 286 f. FENNER, *Die Krankheit im N.T.*, p. 64; it is: "eine reine Epiphaniegeschichte, die unter ungeheuerlicher Steigerung des Wunders die grandiose Macht des Sohnes Gottes auch über Tod und Verwesung zeigen soll und als blosses Semeion darum für eine weitere medizinische Untersuchung nicht in Betracht kommt." DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 363: "Formally the pericope is narrative containing discourse; in substance it might equally well be described as didactic dialogue containing symbolic narrative by way of illustration."

² DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 265 ff.; STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 855. There are various explanations of the meaning of the name, but there is certainty about none of them . . . Where Luke speaks of "a certain village," 10 : 38, the name is mentioned here.

³ Not to be identified with the woman in Lk. 7 : 36-50.

sickness is not unto death, but for the glory of God, that the Son of God may be glorified thereby," demonstrates that Lazarus' illness was a matter of great concern to Jesus, whilst it may also be deduced from it that a special event was imminent, in which the Father and the Son would be glorified.¹ And yet Jesus still remained two days in the place where He was. The reason for this apparently arbitrary and harsh delay was not that Jesus still wanted to settle His affairs in Perea or to test the faith of the family in Bethany, but must be regarded in the light of the words about the glorification of God and the Son of God, verse 4. Jesus' work is done at His "hour;" it is guided by a divine "must."²

A new phase, verses 7-16, is introduced by Jesus' words: "Let us go into Judaea again." However, the disciples reminded Jesus of the danger which threatened Him from the side of the Jews, but Jesus referred them to the "twelve hours" of the day, meaning the time which still remained for Him to perform His work before "night" came.³ In the discussion which follows with the disciples, Lazarus again forms the full centre of interest, and when the disciples misunderstand Jesus' words about Lazarus' "sleep" by seeing in these words a proof of his recovery,⁴ Jesus says outright: "Lazarus is dead." The in itself sad fact of Lazarus' death nevertheless fills Him with joy, since His disciples will presently be strengthened in their faith by a mighty sign. When Jesus for the second time urged that they leave, the disciples were ready to go, encouraged by the determined: "Let us also go, that we may die with him" spoken by Thomas. "With him" means "with Jesus" and not "with Lazarus," as some believe.⁵

¹ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 303, the purpose of the disease is in the first place: "dass sie der Anlass zur Jesu Wundertat sein wird."

² Cf. GRUNDMANN, TWNT, II, p. 21 ff. BARRETT, St. John, considers the probable reason for the delay to be "that John wished to underline the fact that Jesus' movement towards Jerusalem, and so to his death, was entirely self-determined; no more human affection led him into a trap he did not suspect."

³ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 304: "er muss die kurze Zeit, die ihm auf Erden noch bleibt, ausnutzen." UBBINK, Het evangelie van Johannes, also envisages the disciples, who could thus travel safely with Him . . . KEULERS, Joannes: "Although Jesus' day is already approaching the 12th hour, He still continues, as long as it is day, to do the works of the Father who sent him (9, 4)."

⁴ Berakoth 57b: "Six things are a good sign for a sick person, namely sneezing, perspiration, open bowels, seminal emission, sleep and a dream" (ed. Epstein; transl. M. Simon).

⁵ See KEULERS, Joannes, who refutes this view, which is supported among others by Zahn. Cf. BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 305.

Verses 17-19 portray the situation such as it was when Jesus arrived. Lazarus had already been in his tomb for four days. Attempts have been made in various ways to calculate when Lazarus died and how much time Jesus required for the journey. As it is not known where exactly Jesus was in Perea when He received the message, these attempts can never be more than guesses.¹ The meaning of the "four days" is to express that death is irrevocable. For according to popular belief the soul returned to the grave for three days after death. But if it noticed that the colour of the face had changed, it left the corpse. It is for this reason that a visit was paid for the first three days to those who were buried in caves.² The presence of many Jews from Jerusalem to comfort Mary and Martha is explained by the short distance between Bethany and the capital, viz. about two miles.³ The family was therefore well known and respected.

The discussion between Martha and Jesus, verses 20-27, forms the transition to the resurrection miracle. Mary remained seated in the house — for one could receive condolences sitting down — but Martha went to meet Jesus. It is not stated how Martha knew that Jesus was coming. DALMAN refers to a stone east of Bethany, known as the "ass's foal of Lazarus," where the meeting could have taken place.⁴

¹ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 305, note 6: "Wie die vier Tage gerechnet sind, d.h., ob die zwei Tage von V. 6 einbegriffen sind oder nicht, ist gleichgültig." Cf. BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 163 ff.

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 544 f.: "Semachoth 8 Anf.: 'Man geht an die Grabstätte hinaus u. besucht die Verstorbenen drei Tage lang, ohne sich wegen heidnischer (abergläubischer) Bräuche Sorge zu machen. Es geschah, dass man einen besuchte (der scheintot war) u. er lebte noch 25 Jahre, u. hinterher starb er. Ein andrer zeugte noch fünf Kinder, u. hinterher starb er.'" Cf. PREUSS, *Bibl.-Talmud. Medizin*, p. 601 ff. CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 29, points to this belief in Parseism. KRUYT, *Het Animisme*, p. 326, on the three-day mourning ceremonies among the Indonesians in connection with this belief. According to DE ZWAAN, *Inleiding N.T.*, I, p. 143, the point of the story ("at the same time the climax with regard to other resurrections!") relates to this popular belief.

³ A stadium is equal to a Jewish ris, רִיס. Seven and a half ris (a Jewish mil, מִיל) = one Roman mile = 1478.70 metres. Fifteen stadia = 2 Roman miles = 2957.40 metres. See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 544. For the Jewish mourning ceremonies and the seven-day condolence as meritorious work, cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, IV, 1, pp. 592-607. . . . See STÄHLIN, *TWNT*, V, p. 815 ff., on the "comforting." *παράμυθόμα* implies both the idea of "exhorting" and that of "consoling, reassuring."

⁴ DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 268. DALMAN, *Jerusalem*, p. 54. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 324, states that in the present church in Bethphage only the mounting of the ass is recalled. "Jedoch betraf die älteste Schicht des Kultes in diesem Heiligtum die Begegnung Jesu mit Martha und Maria."

Martha's words "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died" contain no note of reproach but of sorrow at Jesus' absence.¹

Martha's faith in Jesus was thus unshaken; might the prayers of the Master perhaps bring her brother back to life? She did not beg Him to do this, but it is evident in what she said. Jesus' answer: "Thy brother shall rise again," must have disappointed her; it sounded in her ears like the usual words of consolation, since she "knew" about the Jewish dogma of the resurrection of the righteous. Jesus' reply: "I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. Believeth thou this?," introduced the great change into the discussion. Martha's thoughts were brought back by these words from the "last day" to the present day; her mind was taken off the dead Lazarus and concentrated on the person speaking to her. UBBINK puts it well when he says: "It is not to the article of faith of the resurrection that Martha should cling, but to him who realized in his person the resurrection and the life."²

Jesus' question was answered by a profession of faith by Martha which is reminiscent of that by Peter at Caesarea Philippi. This concludes the discussion: it ends not with a complaint, but with a confession; in the "genuine attitude of faith, which completely renounces the 'I' and knows only a 'you'," as BULTMANN strikingly remarks.

In verses 28-32 the encounter between Jesus and Mary is described. Martha had gone to call her sister "secretly" — it is not necessary to think here of the enmity of the Jews, but the need to be alone should be envisaged — saying: "The Master is come, and calleth for thee." The sisters were thus in the habit of calling

¹ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 306: "kaum als Vorwurf gedacht, vielmehr als schmerzliches Bedauern." KEULERS, *Joannes*, it is "something of a complaint."

² UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes . . .* KEULERS, *op. cit.*, sees in vv. 25, 26 "the climax of the account" . . . Cf. the profound observations on the meaning of life and death in BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 307 f. The question: Believeth thou this?: "fragt also, ob der Mensch bereit ist, Leben und Tod, so wie er sie kennt, wesenlos sein zu lassen" (p. 308). GÖDAN, *Christus u. Hippokrates*, calls Jesus' words: "I am the resurrection, and the life" so to speak a "Grundsatzklärung." "Bis heute sind diese Worte immer wieder aus dem Zusammenhang herausgerissen und nur auf das ewige Leben bezogen worden. Jesus aber gebraucht sie als Einleitung zur Besiegung des leiblichen Todes" (p. 116). See also VAN HARTINGSVELD, *Die Eschatologie des Johannesevangeliums*, p. 50 ff.

Jesus the Master among themselves. Hurriedly Mary arose to go to Jesus, who was still outside the village, at the place where He had met Martha. The sudden departure of Mary was the signal for the Jews present to follow her, so that soon all were witnesses of Jesus' encounter with Mary. Overcome with grief, Mary fell at Jesus' feet to repeat what the sisters had doubtless said to one another on many an occasion: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died."

The story now reaches a climax, verses 33-44. The tears of Mary and of the Jews who had accompanied her moved Jesus deeply; He "groaned in the spirit, and was troubled." There is a considerable difference of opinion about the meaning of these words. Various old exegetes interpret them as meaning that the "pneuma," the Holy Ghost, raged against the unduly great natural sympathy which Jesus manifested. Others believe that Jesus raged at the powers of sin or at those of death in general, or at death as the cause of sorrow in the house of His friends in particular. Or the unbelief of the Jews or the behaviour of the sisters is regarded as the cause of His wrath. Others think of the scene as such: besides the deep and genuine grief of the sisters Jesus perceives the conventional mourning of the Jews, which arouses His indignation. BULTMANN thinks that Jesus' wrath can only be at the display of unbelief in His presence.¹ KEULERS would prefer to eliminate the idea of wrath, and is of the opinion that all that is meant is that Jesus was overcome with deep grief, which revealed itself outwardly, i.e. He trembled with emotion.²

It seems to us best not to accentuate any particular motives; what we have here is a combination of emotions, well described by UBBINK as follows: "Wrath and grief at the power of unbelief, of sin and death, fill him."³

The following short question by Jesus: "Where have ye laid

¹ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 310. "Man wird diese im Zshg nicht anders verstehen dürfen denn als seinen Zorn über die Glaubenslosigkeit, die sich in der Klage ausspricht, welche in seiner—des Offenbarers—Gegenwart über den Tod des Lazarus erhoben wird" . . . "Das τῷ πνεύμ. bei ἐνεβριμ. ist mit dem ἐν ἑαυτῷ V. 38 völlig gleichbedeutend; es ist Semitismus, vgl. Mk 8, 12" (Anm. 4). Cf. BARRETT, *op. cit.*, who believes "that it was the unbelief of the Jews and of Mary that provoked the indignation of Jesus." They mourned "as those who had no hope."

² KEULERS, Joannes.

³ UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes*. GÖDAN, *op. cit.*, interprets Jesus' wrath as an "Ergrimmen" against death, before whose might all must capitulate (p. 116; cf. p. 134).

him?," has given rise to speculations on the omniscience of Jesus. KEULERS points to Jesus' limited "empirical knowledge," whilst BULTMANN remarks that the story is naive and one should think of Genesis 3:9 and 18:9, which also contain "questions" addressed by God to men.¹ After the words "Lord, come and see," which were probably spoken by the sisters, Jesus went to the tomb and "wept." BULTMANN associates this weeping with Jesus' violent emotions, see verse 33.² It seems more plausible to us to interpret Jesus' weeping as an expression of His sympathy with the sisters. The fact that Jesus wept was regarded by some of the Jews present as proof of His great love of Lazarus, whilst others remarked that the one who had opened the eyes of the blind could also have brought salvation in this case, too. Again moved and indignant, Jesus went to the tomb, which consisted of a cave.³ Jesus commanded that the stone across the mouth of the cave be removed, which caused Martha to cry out in horror: "Lord, by this time he stinketh: for he hath been dead four days." This indicates that Martha did not be-

¹ KEULERS, Joannes. BULTMANN, Das Evangelium des Johannes, p. 310, note 5. VON AMMON, Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu, III, p. 124; this word: "ist eine Diversion, welche Jesus sich selbst und seiner eigenen Beklommenheit macht, den freien Schwung seines Geistes wieder zu gewinnen." Cf. also the section on Jesus' "knowledge."

² BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 310 f.: "Die Angabe, dass er weinte . . . hat schwerlich einen anderen Zweck als den, die Äusserung der Juden (v. 36 f.) zu provozieren und damit jenes Motiv der Glaubenslosigkeit angesichts des Offenbarers heller zu beleuchten" . . . For Jesus' "weeping" another verb (δακρύω) is used than in v. 33 (κλαίω). For the latter see RENGSTORF, TWNT, III, p. 721 ff. WOOLSTON, Discourses on the Miracles, Fifth Discourse, p. (39), wonders whether this weeping of Jesus was not an "absurdity," having regard to the imminent resurrection of Lazarus.

³ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 1049 ff., gives a precise description of these tombs. Cf. also GALLING, Bibl. Reallexikon, col. 237 ff. See DALMAN, Orte u. Wege, p. 265 f., for the place. KEULERS, Joannes: "'Lazarus' tomb," which lies in the vicinity of el-Azarieh and has been venerated since the fourth century, offers guarantees of authenticity." KOPP, Die heiligen Stätten der Ev., p. 333 ff., states that the excavations in 1951-1953 have proved: "dass Bethanien etwas weiter oben nach dem Westen auf dem Abhang des rās esch-schijāh lag." Here the Franciscans have an olive yard. "Die Ausgrabungen stützen die These von der *Echtheit des Grabes*: es entspricht der jüdischen Forderung, da es ausserhalb der Ortschaft liegt. Sodann ehrte eine frühe Tradition es mit einer *Kirche*, schon 390 bezeugt." Further excavations, under the direction of S. J. Saller, Excavations at Bethany, Jerusalem, 1957, brought new facts about the tomb to light . . . MICHEL, TWNT, IV, p. 685, recalls Jn. 5:28 and says that Jn. 11:1-44 is: "eine vorläufige Bestätigung und Verwirklichung dieser eschatologischen Verheissung;" Jn. 11:38 also speaks: "von einem bestimmten Höhlengrab, das durch einen Stein verschlossen ist."

lieve in the possibility of Lazarus' resurrection. Martha's exclamation gives rise to a number of comments. WOOLSTON and VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN find it strange that only Martha speaks of the corpse "stinking."¹ But surely it is obvious that so impulsive a person as Martha would immediately be opposed to this! Some think that Martha's exclamation is in contrast with the fact that the body was embalmed, see verse 44. But the Jewish treatment of corpses was much simpler than that of the Egyptians, cf. Genesis 50 : 2-4. The dead person was washed, see Ac. 9 : 37, and then wrapped in linen cloths, on which spices were sprinkled. KEULERS points out that this treatment could at most prevent the evil smell for some time, but definitely could not stop the process of decomposition.² It therefore need not be presumed that Martha and Mary had for some reason or the other neglected the usual treatment of their dead brother, nor need it be assumed, as BULTMANN does, that the author, in quoting Martha's exclamation, obviously did not think of the dead man having been embalmed.³ Jesus now recalled to Martha His words that, if she believed, she would see the glory of God, see verse 4 and verse 23 ff. The stone was removed and Jesus, with raised eyes,⁴ thanked His father in heaven because He had heard His prayer. "And I knew that thou hearest me always: but because of the people which stand by I said it, that they may believe that thou hast sent me." It will be obvious that this prayer has been subjected to the close scrutiny of criticism. Attempts have been made to brand these verses as false or to put them down to the reflective nature of the author. Or Jesus' praying is regarded not as real prayer, but as a certain gesture, an edifying demonstration for the sake of the bystanders. To SCHLEIERMACHER Jesus' prayer is proof of the fact that the central issue of the resurrection of Lazarus is not a miracle of Christ, but the answering of prayers; a view which lies at the same level as FIEBIG's

¹ WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, Fifth Discourse, p. (30): "None of the Spectators at his Resurrection say one word of his Stinking." VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *Parapsychologie en Godsdienstig leven*, p. 78.

² KEULERS, *Joannes* . . . Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 1047 f. In olden times winding sheets were very sumptuous; this was changed under Rabban Gamliel II, in about 90 A.D. GALLING, *Bibl. Reallexikon*, col. 239: formerly the dead were buried in their clothes, see 1 Sa. 28 : 14; Ez. 32 : 27; since Roman times separate shrouds have been used, cf. Mk. 15 : 46; Jn 11 : 44.

³ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 311, note 3.

⁴ STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 246: looking up to heaven is seldom mentioned; the rule was that in prayer the eye and the heart had to be brought to bear upon the holy of holies of the temple.

opinion of the prayers of the rabbis.¹ BULTMANN rightly says that Jesus does not pronounce a prayer, "but gives thanks for the answer which has already been given." The Son is always certain that He will be heard by the Father; He does not need to pray for it.² It had to be made clear to the bystanders that Jesus was in fact the Father's envoy, the Victor over death. After His prayer Jesus cried out with a loud voice: "Lazarus, come forth." Literally this reads: "Lazarus, hither, come out."³ This sounds different to, stronger than, the "Arise" said by Jesus to Jairus' daughter and the young man at Nain. Lazarus was commanded to come forth from his grave.

Now how do the rationalists view this resurrection? According to PAULUS Lazarus did not revive upon Jesus' command "come forth." These words were nothing more than a greeting: "come out into the arms of your friend!" After all, one does not address a dead man, but a living person. Lazarus had suffered from a curable disease, see verse 4, and had been buried in a state of rigidity. For that reason Martha

¹ SCHLEIERMACHER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 233: "da kommt Christus eigentlich ausser dem Bereich des Wunders, ausgenommen die Festigkeit der Überzeugung, dass das was er bat, auch von Gott geschehen werde, also diese Art von einer alle Analogie mit dem menschlichen übersteigenden Einwirkung fällt für Christum hier weg." Cf. p. 214. FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 37 f.: just as Jesus prayed before the raising of Lazarus, so did Rabbi Yehuda Hannasi (ca 200 A.D.) for a resurrection.

² BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 311. NEANDER, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 608: like all other miracles, this miracle is connected with the whole of Christ's life as a life of prayer. BÜCHSEL, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*: it was not a "Schau-gebet." KEULERS, *Joannes*: "He wishes to teach the bystanders that the resurrection of Lazarus is not a personal act of friendship; in that case he would have healed the sick Lazarus" . . . The Son does the will of the Father, see Jn. 5 : 19, 30; 6 : 38; 7 : 16; 8 : 29; 9 : 4. GROSHEIDE, *Johannes*. "There is no doubt in Jesus' mind. Nor is this a special case of prayers being answered. But He must speak, so that the multitude also knows this." SMELIK, *De Weg van het Woord*, puts it strikingly when he says: "Before Christ performs the miracle, it must as it were be fixed in the prayer."

³ Λάζαρε, δεῦρω ἔξω. BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 312, note 5: the words of resurrection are "als inspiriertes charakterisiert" by the "with a loud voice." UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes*, speaks of "a voice which expresses deep emotion and contains the power of God." KEULERS, *Joannes*: "for not only must every bystander hear it, but it must penetrate into the tomb, and even into the kingdom of the dead." WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, Fifth Discourse, p. (40), asks sarcastically: why a loud voice? Was his soul so far from his body? BARTH, *K.D.*, IV, 2, p. 252: "Das ist der Kampf Jesu für die Sache des Menschen als Gottes Kreatur, die von Gott zum Leben und nicht zum Tod bestimmt ist . . . und indem der tote Lazarus hört und tut wie er geheissen ist, ist das Jesu Sieg in diesem Kampf." SMELIK, *op. cit.* "Christ's speaking is thus a creative deed. He commands Lazarus to be." Smelik compares this with Gen. 1.

had been wrong when she spoke of the corpse "stinking." She had not spoken from experience, "as if she or others had in the meantime been in the tomb." Her exclamation was merely the consequence of a conclusion which she had drawn from the fact that Lazarus had already been buried for four days. "Fortunately in a cave and not in a suffocating coffin." Lazarus had therefore not been "entirely dead." This was PAULUS' argument, then.¹ In VON AMMON's opinion Jesus acted in accordance with a fixed plan, see verses 4, 23, 40, 42. He waited until the very last minute before acting.² Such an opinion is also supported by DE RÉGLA. Jesus: "sees, feels, understands, guesses, if you like, that death has not yet completed its work, and that the man believed dead is only in a state of lethargy."³ Although the authors put forward these arguments as "reasonably" acceptable, they appear so weak and disputable that they have in no way achieved general recognition. Think of STRAUSS' shrewd refutation. It is better to decide radically on a mythical or symbolic explanation than to lose oneself in such cogitation, surmises and conjectures.

What now follows: "And he that was dead came forth, bound hand and foot with graveclothes: and his face was bound about with a napkin," is regarded as a new miracle by various of the older and the more modern exegetes.⁴ Basil considered it the greatest miracle that the completely bound Lazarus could walk! The question is: in what way was the body bound? STRACK-BILLERBECK says that rabbinical literature does not seem to state that the hands and feet of the dead were wrapped with linen bandages or strips.⁵ PAULUS says that the limbs were separately wrapped, so that the body was

¹ PAULUS, *Commentar über das Neue Testament*, IV, 1, p. 543 ff.

² VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, III, p. 129: "Das Wunder der unläugbaren Thatsache besteht demnach darinnen, dass Jesus sie vorhersah, sie nach einem tief durchdachten Plane vorbereitete, bei ihrer Vollziehung den äussersten Punkt ihrer physischen Möglichkeit abwartete, des Gelingens derselben durch den erbetenen Beistand Gottes gewiss war und sie weder ruhmbegierig, noch durch sinnliche Künste, sondern einzig nur durch Förderung der Zwecke seines heiligen Berufes vollbrachte."

³ DE RÉGLA, *Jésus de Nazareth*, p. 251 . . . WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, Fifth Discourse, p. (30), computes the time during which Lazarus was in the tomb as two days and three nights: "which Time, if no Victuals were secretly conveyed with him, a Man might fast in Lazarus' Cave."

⁴ See KEULERS, Joannes. Lagrange, too, still believes this. BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 312: "Das Hervorkommen des noch von den Binden Umwickelten ist selber ein kleines Wunder."

⁵ STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 545.

not bound, but only wound round.¹ But, whatever the way in which Lazarus' body was wrapped — the limbs separately or the whole wrapped in a shroud — it was not done in such a way that any movement was out of the question. The fact that Lazarus was hampered in his movements is evident from Jesus' command: "Loose him, and let him go." John does not go on to say that the graveclothes and the napkin around his face were removed; not a word is said about gratitude, astonishment or acclamation on the part of the bystanders, but the miracle at once acquires a place, a function, in a wider context, viz. in the decision of the Jews to kill Jesus!

We should like to point to some of the many questions and comments which have accumulated around this great miracle. As regards the historical reliability, BORNHÄUSER considers it of the greatest importance that all kinds of details are localized. There was, he says, every opportunity to enquire later in Bethany whether Martha and Mary had lived there between 30 and 40 A.D. and whether their brother Lazarus had really risen from the dead. Even in the year 100 A.D. this was still possible, having regard to the tenacity of old persons' memories. "The bookish scholar smiles at such thoughts; the village priest and the simple man see the importance of them."² This reasoning has as such something attractive about it, but, having regard to the then belief in miracles, yields no objective proof. Think of the Philopseudes of Lucianus!³

It is evident from old literature that at quite an early stage there was considerable interest in the person of Lazarus. Just as other persons in the Gospels gradually rose in esteem — Zacharias was promoted to high priest and the devout Simeon to priest — so Lazarus was perhaps also made a priest.⁴ Many, including Tertullian and Origen, pondered the

¹ PAULUS, *Commentar über das Neue Testament*, IV, 1, p. 576. GROSHEIDE, Johannes. "We cannot say for sure whether Lazarus' limbs had been separately wrapped in bandages, so that he could walk with the bandages on, or whether the body as a whole had been wrapped, so that he as it were slid out of the tomb, as shown in old pictures, see Alford. The former seems to me the more probable." BARRETT, *op. cit.*, rightly says: "It is difficult to visualise the emergence of Lazarus thus bound."

² BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 160 ff.

³ See the Introduction.

⁴ BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 527, note 1... In the apocryphal letter from Pontius Pilate to Emperor Tiberius in Rome the resurrection of Lazarus is specifically mentioned as a miracle of "a certain man Jesus." "By only a word he commanded the dead man, whose body was already in a state of decomposition through the wound-inflicting worms, to arise. And he commanded that stinking body lying in the tomb to walk, and he came forth from the tomb like a bride-

question of where Lazarus' soul had been during the days of his death.¹

A tradition states that Lazarus was thirty years of age when he was raised from the dead and that he lived for a further thirty years.² Quite early on all kinds of symbolic and eschatological indications were discovered in the story. IRENAEUS, for instance, saw in the graveclothes a symbol of man, who was bound in sin, and in the resurrection itself the sign of the resurrection at the last day, see Jn. 5 : 28-29.³ Likewise, John of Damascus adduces the "already decomposing and stinking Lazarus" as proof that Jesus demonstrated the resurrection of the body "not only by the word but also by the deed."⁴

groom from the bridal chamber, full of sweet fragrance." (For the text of the letter, see AUFHAUSER, *Antike Jesus-Zeugnisse*, p. 40 ff.) There is a further tradition in which it is stated that Lazarus became the Bishop of Marseilles, see TRENCH, *op. cit.*, p. 416.

¹ See SCHLINGENSIEPEN, *Die Wunder des N.T.*, p. 58 . . . Medieval authors often used the figure of Lazarus to lend colour to their views of the underworld, see TRENCH, *op. cit.*, p. 416 . . . Cf. the question which the apostle Thomas put to a girl awakened from the dead: "Tell us where you have been." The girl then tells of the terrible scenes which she had seen in hell. See HENNECKE, *Neutestam. Apokr.*, p. 271.

² EPIPHANIUS, *Adv. haereses*, Lib. II, Tom. II, *adv. Manichaeos*, XXXIV.

³ IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, V, 13, 1: "Hoc symbolum eius hominis, qui illigatus fuerat in peccatis" . . . BARRETT, *op. cit.*: "Lazarus came out of the tomb alive under the bandages. It is unlikely that John saw allegorical significance in this statement."

⁴ JOHN OF DAMASCUS, *De Fide Orthodoxa*, IV, 27: Πρώτον μὲν, τεταρταῖον, καὶ ἥδη φθάρνεντα, καὶ ὀδωδότη ἐγείρας τὸν Λάζαρον. Cf. EPIPHANIUS, *Adv. haereses*, Lib. II, Tom. II, *adv. Manichaeos*, XXXIV. In the resurrection at the last day: "the Only-Begotten Son shall, as promised, restore the body to the soul and the soul to the body" . . . It is interesting to compare the exegesis of the early Christian authors with that of present-day exegetes. DODD's train of thought is as follows: "The story of the raising of Lazarus is so conceived as to present a picture of resurrection as it is described in v. 28." But Lazarus will die again! "If therefore his resurrection is, in some sense, a fulfilment of the prediction in vs. 28-9, it must be in a symbolical sense. Not the raising of Lazarus, as σημεῖον, is the fulfilment, but that which the sign signifies . . . It seems we might put it in this way: the evangelist has taken an event associated with the 'last day,' and transplanted it into the historic ministry of Jesus, thus making of it a 'sign' of the ζωοποιήσις which that ministry (when consummated) brought into effect" (*op. cit.*, p. 365 ff.). CULLMANN argues that, as long as the "Endvollendung" has not yet come, the Holy Ghost penetrates: "nur zeitweilig in die Welt des Leibes;" "nur zeitweilig werden die Krankheit und die Macht des Todes zurückgedrängt. Alle im Neuen Testament erzählten Totenerweckungen sind ja nichts Endgültiges. Der Jüngling zu Nain, Lazarus, Tabitha werden nicht zu einem σώμα πνευματικόν auferweckt, sondern sie werden wieder sterben müssen wie alle Menschen. Es ist der einmalige Sinn des Endgeschehens, dass dann erst die Toten wirklich auferstehen werden zu einem σώμα πνευματικόν, dass dann erst

We repeat that acceptance of the historicity of the resurrections of the dead by Jesus Christ is in the final instance a matter of faith. In his account of the resurrection of the young man at Nain Luke attempted to report an actual event, just as John tried to do with his account of the resurrection of Lazarus.¹

The subjective rendering of the event does not in itself entitle one to think of symbolism.

The story of the resurrection of Lazarus is borne by the following four main themes. The resurrection was an act of mercy. It was a proof of Jesus' power over the forces of death, sin and unbelief. It was a sign of the resurrection at the last day. It took place to glorify Jesus as the Son of God by those who were then with Him, Jn. 11 : 4. But at the same time it was also this deed which brought Him nearer to the cross and His final glorification.²

eine Schöpfung ersteht, in der es kein Verwelken und Verwesen mehr gibt." This consummation will concern "Himmel und Erde" (Christus u. die Zeit, p. 125).

¹ GÖDAN, *op. cit.*, remarks that efforts are repeatedly made to reinterpret the accounts of the raising of the dead: "auf das rein Geistige." "Warum aber stehen sie dann eigentlich im Kanon des Neuen Testaments?" Certainly not out of reverence, for during: "der Sichtungsprozess der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung in der alten Kirche" they were not looking for reverence: "sondern nach der Echtheit der historischen Überlieferung." Science has managed to establish: "dass das Neue Testament das bestüberlieferte Buch der Antike ist. So weit reichen die ältesten Handschriftenfunde an die Geschehnisse zurück... So wollen wir mit wissenschaftlich gutem Gewissen auch jener Überlieferung von der Auferweckung des Lazarus Glauben schenken" (p. 115; cf. p. 217, note 8: a symbolic "Umdeutung" of the account is Hellenistic).

² See BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 300 f. It is "Jesu Berufswirken" that brings Him to the cross. The Evangelist deliberately chose this very σημεῖον, which, as a raising from the dead, not only is an account of the greatest of the miracles, but also reveals Jesus at the beginning of His Passion as the "resurrection" and the "life"... KOOLE in Waszink et al., *Het oudste Christendom en de antieke cultuur*, II, p. 225: "In fact the whole of the fourth Gospel is a continual song of praise to the glory of the Son. This glory is not a supernatural splendour, a lustre of immortality, but the Father's satisfaction at the obedient life, work, Passion and death of the Son." See also CADMAN, *The Raising of Lazarus*.

2) THE NATURE MIRACLES

XIII. THE MIRACLE AT THE WEDDING AT CANA

The statement that Jesus turned water into wine during a wedding occurs only in the fourth Gospel, Jn. 2 : 1-11. The objections to this account are legion. These objections are not only of a historical and scientific nature, such as are generally aimed against the miracles, but also of an ethical kind.

As regards the scientific kind, the objectors point to the impossibility of a qualitative change, an impossibility as great as that of the miraculous feeding, where a quantitative change is concerned.¹

The ethical objections are remarkable ones. Jesus' action during the wedding at Cana is considered not only ethically disputable, but even offensive! After all, miracles are performed only to aid people in real need and misery, and certainly not to help them out of an embarrassing situation, to cheer them up or to provide them with a certain "luxury."² Various exegetes therefore exert themselves to throw as favourable a light as possible on Jesus' deed. According to F. BARTH and UBBINK, it is anything but pleasant for simple people to be suspected of meanness on a festive occasion, whilst BÜCHSEL perceives Jesus' kindness in His fulfilling the wants of "carnal man."³

¹ STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 221: In the wine miracle the substratum is qualitatively changed, it is: "somit eine eigentliche Transsubstantiation." Strauss will not hear of this.

² TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.*, remarks the following about the miracle at Cana: "Dass dasselbe als wirkliche Tatsache angenommen, dem frommen Empfinden zunächst eher einen Anstoss, als eine Stärkung bietet, ist von verschiedenen theologischen Richtungen zugegeben" (p. 63). Traub says that we are concerned here with an allegory (p. 65). BÜCHSEL, *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, Das NTD, I, 2, p. 44. . . . SCHLEIERMACHER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 222, says that there was no question of an emergency at Cana: "es war aber der Zustand einer geselligen Verlegenheit." STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 226. Is this a "luxury" miracle? No immediate benefit is to be seen in it. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 98: "Jedem Bibelleser fällt auf, dass Jesus hier nicht Rettung in einer Not bringt, sondern in einer Verlegenheit aushilft und dass diese Hilfe keineswegs notwendig, ja vielleicht sogar bedenklich ist, jedenfalls mit evangelischem Ethos nichts zu tun hat." Cf. BIELER, *op. cit.*, p. 116, on the purpose of the miracle from the point of view of the miracle-worker: "Das Ursprüngliche ist wohl, dass die Wunder keinen anderen Zweck haben, als einem Notstand abzuhelpen . . ." See also BARTH, *K.D.*, IV, 2, p. 245.

³ F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 137: "Unnötig und gefährlich kann die Gabe

Other such remarks could be added to the above ones, and in the course of our investigation we shall encounter further remarkable views. First we wish to make a number of exegetic comments on the account as a whole. Then a survey follows of the various explanations. Finally, possibilities and conclusions will be given.

(a) *Exegetic comments*

Everyone will be struck by the fact that the story is told skilfully and vividly; in form we have here, says BULTMANN, the image of a "typical miracle story."¹ In verses 1 and 2 time, place and situation are given, the first two inadequately: "And the third day there was a marriage in Cana of Galilee," verse 1. Usually the "third day" is counted from the day on which Jesus set out for Galilee (1 : 43) and not from His arrival in Galilee. There is considerable difference of opinion.² This is also the case with the localization of the scene of action. Three times John speaks of a place Cana of Galilee — in 2 : 1, 4 : 46 and 21 : 2. However,

Jesu nur dem erscheinen, welcher vergisst, was es für ärmere Leute bedeutet, an einem ihrer seltenen festlichen Tage ihre Mittellosigkeit eingestehen oder sich dem Verdacht des Geizes aussetzen zu müssen." It was not a "Schauwunder." BÜCHSEL, *op. cit.*, p. 45: "Er neigt sich freundlich herunter zu den Bedürfnissen der fleischlichen Menschen, in deren Gemeinschaft er nun einmal gestellt ist." PAULUS, *Commentar über das Neue Testament*, IV, 1, p. 151. One could see: "wie human und wohlthätig er denke und handle." UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes*.

¹ BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 79: "Auf die Form gesehen, liegt eine typische Wundergeschichte vor. V. 1-2 gibt die Exposition, V. 3-5 die Vorbereitung des Wunders, die stilgemäss so erzählt ist, dass sie die Spannung weckt, V. 6-8 das Wunder selbst, ebenfalls stilgemäss nur indirekt berichtet unter Verschweigung des eigentlichen wunderbaren Vorgangs; V. 9-10 bildet den Abschluss, der wieder stilgemäss das παράδοξον des Wunders hervorhebt." DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 68, classifies the account as a "Novelle."

² Jn. 1 speaks in vv. 29 and 35 of "the next day" and in v. 43 of "the day following." One can arrive at a count of 6 or 7 days. The latter is counted as follows: the start is 1 : 19, then vv. 29 and 35 follow; between vv. 40-42 a day is assumed; then vv. 43 and 2 : 1. Seven days—and lo, symbolism rushes headlong towards us, with the example of the week of Creation! See BOISMARD, *Du Baptême à Cana*, p. 14 f. John took the seven days: "comme cadre des premiers événements de la vie du Christ dans un but symbolique: il veut souligner le parallélisme théologique qui existe entre la première création du monde, en sept jours, effectuée par le Verbe de Dieu (cf. Jo., 1, 1-5) et l'œuvre du salut messianique considérée comme une création nouvelle dans le Christ (cf. Jo., 1, 3, 17)." If 6 days are calculated, the contrast with the epiphany of Dionysus, dated on the sixth day, can be derived. Cf. BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*; BARRETT, *St. John*; KEULERS, Joannes; SCHMIDT, *Der joh. Charakter der Erzählung vom Hochzeitswunder in Kana*, p. 33.

since there were a number of places of this name in Galilee, localization will remain a question of the investigator's personal preference. And in any case BULTMANN is right when he says that it is of little importance to the exegesis to know exactly which Cana was meant.¹ Little or nothing is said about the wedding itself: "the mother of Jesus was there; And both Jesus was called, and his disciples, to the marriage." It is understandable that attempts have been made to supplement and embellish these scanty data, but the danger of reading meanings into the author's words is ever-present! We should like to make a few comments in the form of questions. Was Mary related to the bride or bridegroom, or friendly with them? Must it be deduced from Mary's words to Jesus: "They have no wine" (verse 3) and from her instructions to the servants that she was helping to run the wedding and so was not present merely as a guest? Why are we told nothing about the rest of the family? Had Jesus and His disciples been invited to the wedding via Nathanael, who came from Cana, Jn. 21 : 2?

As regards the number of disciples, must we think only of those named in Jn. 1 : 35-51, as UBBINK and KEULERS do, or of the twelve, which BULTMANN and BARRETT prefer to do?²

There is no point in trying to establish the identity of the bridal couple, or at least that of the groom. Candidates suggested have

¹ BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* . . . DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 108 f., thinks of Chirbet Cana, situated nine miles north of Nazareth. Others seek the place of the wedding in the village of Kefr or Kufr Kenna, which lies about five miles north-east of Nazareth (p. 119 f.). Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 400. BARRETT, *op. cit.* "At the present time there exist three villages Kefr Kenna, Qanat el Gelil, and 'Ain Qana, all of which roughly satisfy the requirements of our text. Little is to be gained by an attempt to decide between them. John's *τῆς Φαλιλαίας* is intended not merely to identify the Cana in question, but also to indicate that the first miracle took place not in Judaea but in Galilee." KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, pp. 184-195, gives a detailed and profusely documented survey of the question: Chirbet Cana or Kefr Kenna. "Die biblischen Angaben sind zu dürftig, um den Streit zwischen den beiden Rivalen zu entscheiden . . . Archäologisch schwingt das Pendel mehr nach Chirbet Kāna." Kopp supports Chirbet Cana as the "genuine" Cana. SCHNEIDER, *Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums*, I, p. 141, still defends the symbolic explanation of Cana given by Grill (J. Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums*, 1902). In this theory Cana is not a place; the Hebrew Qana (קָנָה, reed, straw) "simply" means narthex (νάρθηξ = reed-stem): "das heilige Symbol des Dionysoskultus."

² UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes*; KEULERS, *op. cit.*: BULTMANN, *op. cit.*; BARRETT, *op. cit.*

included Simon the Zealot and John the Evangelist, but there is not the slightest basis for such surmises.¹

It is not possible to determine the time at which Jesus received the invitation, and it is equally impossible to state the day on which Jesus and His disciples arrived at the feast. However, it should be taken into account that arriving in the midst of a wedding, which lasted for seven days in the case of a first marriage, was not unusual.² This is the reason why the exegesis which tries to make Jesus and His disciples responsible in some way for the "shortage" of wine — even by pointing to a hurried journey, which had given them a thirst! — is untenable.

When this shortage is ascertained, a new phase begins. "And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine," verse 3. It may be assumed that the wedding had already been underway for several days when this deficiency was discovered. During a Jewish wedding the wine flowed freely.³

Now did Mary make her remark to share her worries with Jesus, and did she by these words make a forbidden appeal to the power of her son to help the host out of an embarrassing situation? BULTMANN rejects all such psychological interpretations and sees the whole within the framework of the miracle style: the suspense has to be intensified!⁴

¹ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, calls all this "guessing," which ought to be "a thing of the past." "Aber auch eine Vermutung wie die, dass die Hochzeitsleute arme Leute gewesen seien, ist verboten." . . . STAUFFER, TWNT, I, p. 652 f., states the view of H. Schmidt, *Die Erzählung von der Hochzeit zu Kana. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* 1931: Schmidt suspects that in the original version of the story Jesus may have been the bridegroom! Cf. Jn. 3 : 29 and Mk. 2 : 19. It is going to take a lot of arguments to make this view plausible . . . For engagements, weddings and marriage in Jewry see among others STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, pp. 372-399; I, pp. 500-518; STAUFFER, TWNT, I, p. 646 ff.; JEREMIAS, TWNT, IV, p. 1092 ff.

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 506 . . . For the corruptness of the text see BARRETT, *op. cit.* SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 33, considers it "spitzfindig" to assume on the strength of the verb form "was called" (ἐκλήθη, aorist), that Jesus and His disciples were not invited until later. This is the basis for the fantasies about the embarrassment that Jesus is said to have caused, etc. It is therefore anything but a: "wesentlicher Zug der Kana-Geschichte" that Jesus arrived later at the feast!

³ STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 401: "Der Weinkonsum ist bei einer jüdischen Hochzeit gewiss nicht gering gewesen; denn die Hochzeiten dauerten sieben Tage, u. täglich pflegten neue Gäste zu erscheinen."

⁴ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, refers to other refusals and delays, Mk. 7 : 27; Mt. 8 : 7 ("als abweisende Frage zu lesen!"); cf. Jn. 4 : 48; Mk. 9 : 19 ff.

At the same time expectations are kept alive by Jesus' original refusal in the gruff-sounding answer: "Woman, what have I to do with thee? mine hour is not yet come." Although the word "woman" does not sound cordial, it is not meant disrespectfully or contemptuously.¹

The following: "what have I to do with thee?" cannot be misunderstood, however. This is definitely a refusal: at a certain point Jesus deliberately stands aloof from His mother.² However, one

¹ OEPKE, TWNT, I, p. 776: "Die Anrede (ὁ) γυναῖ Mt 15, 28; Lk 13, 12; 22, 57; J 2, 4; 4, 21 (8, 10 vl); 19, 26; 20, 13, 15; 1 K 7, 16 ist keineswegs unehrerbietig oder geringschätzig. Wenn aber Jesus bei Johannes (2, 4; 19, 26) seine Mutter so nennt, so ist das Sohnesverhältnis ausgeschaltet." STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 401: "Das blosse אִשָּׁה 'Frau' als Anrede zB Dêrek Erets 5: Hillel der Alte (um 20 v. Chr.) veranstaltete ein Mahl für einen Menschen. Es kam ein Armer u. stand an seiner Tür u. sprach (zu Hillels Gattin): Frau אִשָּׁה, ich muss heute Hochzeit machen u. habe gar keine Ausrichtung (für das Hochzeitsmahl). Da nahm seine (Hillels) Gattin אִשְׁתּוֹ, das ganze Mahl (das sie zugerichtet hatte) u. gab es ihm." Cf. BULTMANN, op. cit.; BARRETT, op. cit. VAN DEN BUSSCHE, Het boek der tekens, p. 207, prefers the translation "Madam."

² The: "τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί," מַה לִּי וְלָךְ, is a very common expression: see Judg. 11 : 12; 2 Sa. 16 : 10; 19 : 22; 1 Ki. 17 : 18; 2 Ki. 3 : 13; 2 Ch. 35 : 21; Isa. 3 : 15; 22 : 1; Jer. 2 : 18; Hos. 14 : 9. The possessed said it to Jesus: Mt. 8 : 29; Mk. 1 : 24; 5 : 7; Lk. 4 : 34; 8 : 28. BARRETT, op. cit., compares the way the possessed address Jesus with Jesus' words to His mother: "You have no business with us—yet. Similarly the reply of Jesus seems to mean: You have no claims upon me—yet." BULTMANN, op. cit., remarks: "Die Formel bedeutet nicht Abweisung der Gemeinschaft schlechthin sondern bezieht sich auf den konkreten vorliegenden Fall." KEULERS, op. cit., refers to the publication by B. Alfrink, Quid mihi et tibi est (Joa 2, 4) Ned. Kath. St. 1935, pp. 67-74, in which the interpretation of the text along the lines of: "what do you want of me?" is discussed . . . Keulers himself interprets Jesus' words as a refusal and difference of opinion on this particular point. However, tone and gesture are of great influence here, he thinks. BAUER, Das Leben Jesu, p. 329, points out that Jesus' harsh words to His mother were read with sorrow at a very early stage. Note 1: "Ein sahidisches Fragment (Texts und Stud. IV 2 S. 166) sucht sich durch die Versicherung zu helfen, Jesus hätte die Worte: 'Weib, was willst du von mir?' mit süßer Stimme gesprochen." BOISMARD, op. cit., discusses v. 4 in detail. He refers with approval to the suggestion by H. Seemann (Aufgehellte Bibelstellen, in the Benediktinische Monatschrift, 1952, Heft 5-6) that Jesus' words be interpreted as a question: "Has mine hour not yet come?" The "Woman, what have I to do with thee" is then a reproach. Mary does not ask for a miracle: "elle fait simplement part au Christ de l'embarras de tous, sans songer qu'il a la puissance d'arranger les choses . . . Jésus reproche donc à sa mère de rester avec des vues trop humaines et d'oublier que l'heure de sa manifestation glorieuse est arrivée: 'Mon heure n'est elle pas encore venue?' Puisque l'heure est venue, Marie n'a pas à s'inquiéter, son fils a le pouvoir d'arranger les choses. Marie comprend alors cet affectueux reproche de son fils, et c'est pourquoi elle dit aux serviteurs: 'Faites tout ce qu'il vous dira' " (p. 156 f.).

need in no way think of the resistance of a temptation. Jesus motivated His refusal by adding: "mine hour is not yet come." Here again it is evident how greatly the explanation of the parts, i.e. of the verses, is dominated by the interpretation of the whole.

If the remark of Jesus' mother: "They have no wine" is simply taken as a gentle hint to Him to leave, Jesus' answer may be interpreted as a simple "my hour of departure has not yet come."

The situation becomes entirely different when, like BULTMANN, one investigates the significance which the "hour" occupies in the world of witchcraft and astrology.

BULTMANN believes that the miracle-worker "is governed by a law of his own and must listen to another voice."¹ According to the spiritualistic explanation which GREBER gives, the spirits must have the time and opportunity to work quietly. When Jesus changed water into wine: "it was likewise the spirit-world of God which performed this."²

For purposes of exegesis one can let oneself be guided by the significance of the word "hour" in the fourth Gospel, again arriving at different interpretations. Jesus several times means by His "hour" the hour of His Passion and death, and that of His glorification. Some scholars have stressed the Passion, others the glorification.³ Often the glory of Jesus is interpreted as the Messianic glory, the

¹ BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*. Cf. BARRETT, *St. John*. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, pp. 401-405, points to rabbinical pronouncements, in which the significance of the hour of man's birth, of his fate and sorrow, is discussed. BULTMANN rightly says that these places have an: "etwas anderen Sinn."

² GREBER, *Der Verkehr mit der Geisterwelt*, p. 337 f. "Darum konnte auch Christus diese Verwandlung nicht in dem Augenblick vornehmen, wo seine Mutter es wünschte. Seine Stunde war deswegen noch nicht gekommen, weil die dazu erforderliche Arbeit der Geisterwelt noch nicht beendet war. Auch die Arbeit der Geister erfordert Zeit."

³ KEULERS, *op. cit.*, states that, in imitation of Augustine, among others Braun, *Revue Thomiste* 1950, pp. 450-453, thinks that the hour of Jesus' Passion is meant here. BARRETT, *op. cit.*, says that "the hour of Jesus refers to his death on the cross and exaltation in glory" and that it is "unthinkable" that in this verse "hour" could have another meaning. At the same time he considers it "legitimate to compare the use of similar expressions in Hellenistic miracle and magical literature . . . The essential movement of the life of Jesus is described in Hellenistic as well as Old Testament language. The hour when men may expect to see the divine glory manifested in the creative activity of the son of God has not yet come. Cf. 7, 6, 39." K. L. SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 37, says that the "hour" relates both to the "Passions-Stunde" and to Jesus' doxa. Here we are concerned with the doxa. "An die Passion selbst muss noch nicht gedacht werden." See also VAN DEN BUSSCHE, *Het boek der tekens*, p. 41 ff.; p. 208 ff. John means Jesus' "final hour." WILKENS, *op. cit.*, p. 38 ff.

revelation of which occurs at the time intended by the Father, so that all human influence, that is to say including that of Jesus' mother, is excluded.¹

It seems to us to be quite clear that the author had some intention in putting these words in Jesus' mouth, since the concepts "hour" and "time" in the fourth Gospel are usually meant in a specific sense. They then relate to the time, the moment, the decisive time.² At the same time they designate that which is incomprehensible and baffling to ordinary man, the unattainable that is announced in the form of a prophecy.

K. L. SCHMIDT has rightly indicated the following two motives. He says that this incident may be compared with that of Jesus' attitude towards His brothers, Jn. 7 : 1-9. To them, too, Jesus said: "My time is not yet come." SCHMIDT supposes that Jesus' relatives were on the side of the Jews, whose desire for a miracle Jesus did not fulfil. This is the first motive. The second motive which SCHMIDT quotes is the fact that Jesus preferred to take the initiative Himself, cf. Jn. 7 : 6; 11 : 6, 17. Jesus thus at first refuses to perform the miracle, and yet does so afterwards! Why? SCHMIDT here points to a certain discord between opposition to the miracle and acceptance of it. This tension is part of Johannine piety.³ Besides these two motives there is in our opinion a third possibility, viz. the motive of concealment. Jn. 7 : 10 says that Jesus went up to the feast "not

¹ UBBINK, op. cit. As Mary's obedient son Jesus had gone to the Jordan. "But now that He has entered upon His ministry, obedience to the Father takes precedence above all else. If the Father gives Him a hint, the moment for action has come." BRANDT, *Das ewige Wort*. "Jesus meint die Stunde zum messianischen Handeln." KEULERS, op. cit., with reference to v. 11. SCHMIDT, op. cit., p. 34. SCHNEIDER, TWNT, II, p. 930, points out that the verb *ἔρχεσθαι*, come, is used in the Gospel of John, like the verb *ἐρχεσθαι*, "als Ausdruck der Epiphanie." STAUFFER, *Die Theologie des N.T.*, p. 11, speaks of the: "geheimen Stunden-schlag des Christusweges." Jesus rejects His mother's hint. "Er hat es allein mit Gott zu tun und wartet auf seinen Wink. Dann tut er das Wunder." See also BARTH, K.D., III, 2, p. 524 ff., § 47, I. Jesus, der Herr der Zeit. Jesus lives in His "time": "nicht nur mit Gott, sondern für Gott—und nicht nur mit den Menschen, sondern für sie . . ." (p. 527). For Jn. 2 : 4, see p. 555.

² ὥρα, hour, occurs as a statement of time in Jn. 1 : 39; 4 : 6; 4 : 52, 53; 11 : 9; 16 : 21. In the sense of decisive or future hour it is used in: 4 : 21, 23; 5 : 25, 28; 7 : 30; 8 : 20; 12 : 23, 27; 13 : 1; 16 : 2, 4, 25, 32; 17 : 1.

³ K. L. SCHMIDT, op. cit., p. 37: "Dieser Zwiespalt muss anerkannt und nicht als eine Handhabe zu Interpolationshypothesen benutzt, sondern als eine Spannung innerhalb der johanneischen Frömmigkeit gedeutet werden . . . In den Versen 3 und 4 der Kana-Geschichte befinden wir uns also ganz in der johanneischen Sphäre."

openly, but as it were in secret.”¹ Not only did Jesus not desire the publicity which His brothers — who did not believe in Him — urged, but He also did not wish the publicity which His mother — who did believe in Him — sought after. Neither the bridegroom nor the governor of the feast presently knows where the good wine comes from. At the time determined by Jesus Himself in communion with the Father the revelation sheds its secrecy and the glory becomes visible to all who believe.

It may be deduced from Mary's instructions to the servants that she did not interpret her Son's answer as absolutely negative. According to KEULERS the many questions which Mary's attitude evokes can be given only this answer: "Mary knew her son and knew from his gaze, his tone and his gestures what he meant. Her mother's heart told her what his words had not said."² How was it possible that Mary could order the servants to do something? BULTMANN says that we should "of course" not "ponder" this, but should instead admire the "economy of the miracle story."³ The exhortation to cease pondering "of course" gives no solution, any more than BORNHÄUSER does with his surmise that the servants were not residents of Cana, but Jesus' six disciples! According to him, this would at the same time solve the difficulty of the servants' silence.⁴

¹ Cf. ΟΕΡΚΕ, TWNT, III, p. 975 f. In the fourth Evangelist Jesus' numinous reserve, His "self-concealment," κρύπτω, which offends unbelievers, comes to the fore. Cf. BULTMANN, *Theologie des N.T.*, p. 392, where the following is said about Jesus' brothers, Jn. 7 : 3 ff.: "Sie verstehen die Art des Wirkens der Offenbarung nicht, sie verstehen nicht, dass für den Standpunkt der Welt die Offenbarung immer ein κρυπτόν sein muss, und dass sie dennoch ἐν παρρησίᾳ geschieht, freilich nicht in demonstrativer Aufdringlichkeit, sondern in der undemonstrativen Alltäglichkeit. Was von den Wundern Jesu gilt, dass sie nicht verstanden werden, gilt vom Tun Jesu überhaupt" . . . CULLMANN, *Christus u. die Zeit*, p. 35 ff., points out that nowhere in the New Testament does the concept "time," καιρός, come to the fore as clearly as in Jn. 7 : 6. The brothers can always go to Jerusalem whenever they want: "Christus nicht, denn er steht mitten drin in dem göttlichen Heilsplan, dessen Kairoi genau von Gott bestimmt sind." Cullmann rightly comments that Jn. 2 : 4: "überhaupt eine genaue Parallele zu der Perikope Joh. 7, 1-13 bildet." Cf. *Urchristentum u. Gottesdienst*, p. 41 ff.

² KEULERS, *op. cit.* Keulers compares the initial refusal of the miracle by Jesus and the fact that He nevertheless performs it later with Jesus' attitude with regard to the woman of Cana, Mt. 15 : 21-28. BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 81: "... die Mutter hat ihren Sohn verstanden; was sich tun lässt, ist nur eines: bereit sein für die Befehle des Wundertäters."

³ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

⁴ BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 42 ff.: "Die 'Diener' sind nicht Leute aus Kana, die beim Festmahl zu Tische dienen, sondern sie sind die sechs Schüler Jesu. Heisst nicht der Schüler meschareth = δίακονος = Diener?"

In verses 6-8 the miracle itself is related, that is to say the event as such is not described, but is indirectly stated in the account.¹ At Jesus' command six stone water pots, which had been set down in accordance with the purification customs of the Jews, were filled with water. In the Jewish ceremonial both the hands and the tableware had to be cleansed of ritual impurities.² The volume of the pots varied between two and three firkins ("firkin" here translates the old Greek measure "metretes," or approximately ten gallons), so that the total volume was between 120 and 180 gallons.³

It may be deduced from Jesus' command that part of the water had already been used. "Fill the waterpots with water. And they filled them up to the brim," verse 7. In other words, there were

(vgl. 2 Kön. 6, 15)." The governor of the feast is surprised: the servants *know!* "Das Wunder, das eben geschehen ist, ist nicht ein Renommierwunder eines eiteln Gauklers. Es ist nur für sie geschehen, nur für sie. Darum schweigen sie." . . . However, we must interpret the word *δίακονος* (servant) as an attendant at table, such as assisted at a wedding feast. Cf. BEYER, TWNT, II, p. 88 ff. BARRETT, St. John, p. 159: "*δίακονοι* is not the most natural word for household servants. It may have been used here because the servants in bearing the wine to the guests at the feast recalled the activity of 'deacons' in pagan and Christian cultus."

¹ Cf. BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 82: "Der Leser weiss, ohne dass es gesagt ist: das Wasser—und welch gewaltige Menge!—ist in Wein verwandelt. Dass der wunderbare Vorgang nicht beschrieben wird, entspricht dem Stil der Wundergeschichte; das göttliche Handeln bleibt Geheimnis." DIBELIUS, Die Formgeschichte, p. 88: "Es wird nicht gesagt, wie das Wasser zu Wein wurde, auch nicht, wie der Wein den Gästen mundet; es wird nur erzählt, dass der Tafel-aufseher den Bräutigam schilt, weil er *diesen* Wein nicht eher spendiert habe!"

² *ἦσαν δὲ ἕκαστῃ λίθιναι ὑδρίαί τιξ, Jn. 2 : 6. ὑδρία, אֲרֻזָּה or קִיּוּיָּת*; see STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, pp. 695-705, and IV, 2, pp. 611-639, Ein alt-jüdisches Gastmahl, for the rinsing or sprinkling of the hands with water. SCHÜRER, Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes, II, pp. 481-483; EDERSHEIM, The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, II, p. 9 ff. R. MEYER, HAUCK, TWNT, III, p. 416 ff. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, pp. 405-407. According to Maimonides (1135-1204) stone is proof against ritual impurity. Earthenware, on the other hand, does become ritually impure. We encounter this view even earlier, according to Strack-Billerbeck, "Dem entspricht Schab 96a die Tradition im Namen des R. Eleazar (um 270): Gefässe aus Kuhdünger, aus Steinen u. aus Erde nehmen keine Unreinheit an, weder nach den Worten der Tora noch nach den Worten der Schriftgelehrten . . . Das ist für die Verwendung der steinernen Gefässe massgebend gewesen."

³ A metretes is an Attic measure of liquid volume. According to LÜBKERS, Reallexikon, p. 1148, a *μετρητής* = 12 *χόες* = 192 *κοτύλαι* = 39.294 litres (later Attic system). Now the Attic metretes is almost identical with the Jewish bath. 1 bath = 6 hin = 72 log. 1 log is computed at 0.547125 litre or, rounded off, 0.54 litre. 1 metretes (bath) thus contains 72 × 0.547125 litre = 39.393 litres. This is rounded off to 40 litres, or about 10 gallons. See STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 407; GALLING, Bibl. Reallexikon, col. 366-368.

120-180 gallons of good wine available to the guests at the wedding. BULTMANN rightly remarks that it is foolish to try and reduce the quantity of wine or to regard the presence of Jesus as a guarantee that the wine was not abused.¹ KEULERS' argument that Jesus "was not parsimonious in his miracles" has too much of an earthly ring to it. Then Jesus instructed the servants to draw the water out of the pots and to take it to the governor of the feast. "And they bare it." The water was probably drawn with a jug, from which the governor of the feast filled a goblet.² Some have pondered the question of the exact moment at which the change from water into wine took place. KEULERS believes that the miracle occurred at the moment when Jesus ordered that the water be drawn from the pots with a goblet. Westcott's suggestion, viz. that the servants had first to fill the pots from a spring and that the water brought straight from the spring to the feast changed into wine, is untenable, as BERNARD and BARRETT rightly remark. Moreover, the event must not be played down by asserting that the drink was must, i.e. unfermented and therefore innocuous wine!³

¹ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 82. This is aimed at, among others, BERNARD, St. John, who says: "It must, however, be observed that Jn. does not say explicitly that the entire contents of the water-jars were turned into wine. 'The water which had become wine' was that which was served to the ruler of the feast, and Jn. says nothing of any other."

² KEULERS, op. cit., envisages drawing with a goblet. HOMER, *Odyssey*, XVIII, 397, speaks of a "wine-jug" (πρόχοος), which fell with a crash on the floor. The "governor of the feast," the ἀρχιτρίκλινος, architriclinus, was the steward, the "Festordner" (BAUER, Griech.-deu. Wörterbuch). He was the slave who was responsible for the smooth running of the feast. BAUER, *Das Johannesevangelium*. The ἀρχιτρίκλινος is not the man chosen by the guests to preside over the feast, but: "das Haupt der Aufwärter, der τραπεζοποιός, triclinarches." BARRETT, op. cit., says of him: "The word may mean 'head-waiter'; but the man seems perhaps a little too familiar with the bridegroom and a little too unfamiliar with the servants and their movements for this, and we may suppose that he was one of the guests appointed as arbiter bibendi, toast-master, or 'president of the banquet'." But the arbiter bibendi or συμποσίαρχος was chosen by and from the guests of the symposium, see LÜBKERS, *Reallexikon*, p. 1060. In that case we can hardly speak of a "head-waiter." The figure of the ἀρχιτρίκλινος does not occur in the rabbinical writings, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 407. BARRETT therefore thinks that the connection between this story and the Jewish background is uncertain. "It may be of Hellenistic origin."

³ BARRETT, op. cit. ἀντλήω, drawing, is used for drawing water from a well, cf. Jn. 4 : 7, 15. This inspired Westcott's suggestion that the pots were filled from a spring "and that the water drawn subsequently and carried direct from the well to the feast was miraculously transformed into wine." BERNARD, St. John. "Jn. clearly means his readers to believe that what was served to the ruler of the feast was drawn from the water-jars: and that it was then served as a beverage . . .

In the concluding verses, 8-10, the impression which the miracle made is described. Only few people are concerned in this. The governor of the feast was unaware of what had happened, as was the bridegroom. After the former had tasted the water "that was made wine" — "and knew not whence it was" — he said to the bridegroom: "Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse: but thou hast kept the good wine until now." As the governor asked this question, are we to assume that he had seen or heard nothing of the drawing from the water pots? And what did the servants really know? Did they only know that they had drawn from the water pots, and nothing more, or did they also know that in the meantime the water had become wine? BERNARD presumes the former, whereas KEULERS puts forward the suggestion that when drawing the water the servants probably noticed — for instance through the aroma — that it had changed into wine.¹ The bridegroom in fact plays no part at all in this story. All that happens is that he is asked here for a certain explanation of what has happened. The comment by the governor of the feast is explained by KEULERS as a "compliment with witty undertones" and not as a reproach, as some interpret it. What the governor says does not express a general "rule." Serving of less good after good wine has at all times been considered a reprehensible practice.²

The modern notion that 'wine' in the N.T. means unfermented, non-intoxicating wine is without foundation." K. L. SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 35; "Anschaulich wird berichtet, dass die Gefässe bis oben hin gestrichen voll werden. 'Nun bringet die Krüge vom Tafelmeister' (v. 8). In diesem 'nun' ist das inzwischen eingetretene Wunder, das nicht besonders erzählt ist, eingeschlossen." GROSHEIDE, Johannes. "Nūv, now, indicates the moment, and probably the moment at which the miracle occurred." BRANDT, *Das ewige Wort*. "Von dem Wunder selbst erfahren wir nichts. Es wird nicht erklärt und nicht beschrieben, sondern nur bezeugt." WILKENS, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

¹ BERNARD, *op. cit.* It is not clear whether John wishes to tell us "that the servants had noticed any change in the beverage which they served. They knew that they had taken it from the waterpots (or from one of them): that is all." KEULERS, *op. cit.* The servants say nothing to the governor of the feast. "John emphasizes that the servants well knew where the wine came from: they were the reliable witnesses of Jesus' first miracle. Through them the disciples and the guests discovered what had happened." SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 41, says that the not entirely clear "whence it was" in v. 9 relates first and foremost to the wine. "Zugleich aber liegt hier eine christologische Formel vor." The "whence" also occurs in 7 : 27 f.; 8 : 14; 9 : 29 f.; 19 : 9. It relates to "knowing" and "not knowing."

² BULTMANN, *op. cit.* "Die Regel, die der ἀρχιτρ. V. 10 ausspricht, widerspricht wie dem heutigen, so auch dem antiken Brauch." Reference is made to H. Win-

It goes without saying that no conclusions may be drawn from the governor's remark about the effect which the wine may have had on the guests at the wedding!

It is true that the surprising element of the miracle is brought to the fore by the governor of the feast, but the conclusion differs considerably from the emphasized acclamation, astonishment, horror, etc., which we find in the Synoptists. Nor does Jesus make a speech or hold a discussion here; the fourth Evangelist concludes his account by stating three facts:

1. Jesus did this as the beginning of His signs at Cana of Galilee.
2. He manifested His glory.
3. His disciples believed in Him, verse 11. We shall return to this verse presently.

(b) *Analogous stories*

The Old Testament contains a number of accounts in which it is stated that something "happened" to water or that pots were filled. Ex. 7 : 14-25 contains the account of the changing of the water of the Nile into blood. In Ex. 15 : 23-25 it is said that the bitter waters of Marah became sweet after Moses had thrown into the waters a tree shown him by Yahweh. Elisha "healed" water that was "naught" by means of salt, 2 Ki. 2 : 19-22. In the last two cases the water remained water; the change was not essential but incidental. In 2 Ki. 4 : 1-7 we find the story of the empty vessels which, upon a word from Elisha, were filled with oil that did not stop flowing until the last vessel was full, whilst in Jer. 13 : 12-14 there is the reference to the bottles which "shall be filled with wine." Although some of these accounts have a little in common with the miracle described in Jn. 2 : 1-11, it can hardly be claimed, as STRAUSS does, that the latter miracle has its prototype in the Old Testament.¹

Interesting things are told of the deity Dionysus or Bacchus and the cult devoted to him, in which wine played a very large part.²

disch, ZNTW, 14 (1913), pp. 248-257, on the "joh. Weinregel." Cf. BARRETT, St. John.

¹ STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 221 ff., refers for his mythical explanation to texts like this. He further mentions Ex. 17 : 1 ff.; Judg. 15 : 18 ff.; Nu. 20 : 1 ff. (p. 236).

² See the work by JEANMAIRE on DIONYSUS. PREISKER, *Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 157-164. Dionysus is: "die lebenserhaltende und lebensschaffende Kraft in der ganzen Natur, in der Tier- und Pflanzenwelt; seine Zeugungskraft lebt nicht nur in den Säften der Früchte, besonders des Weines, sondern im

In many classical writings the exuberant festivals in honour of Dionysus are described and celebrated. EURIPIDES tells of fountains of wine, milk and honey, whilst HORACE devoted a fine song of praise to Bacchus.¹ Dionysus' female followers, the bacchantes, make wine and milk spurt from the earth and honey drip from the thyrsus, i.e. the staff wound with ivy and vines surmounted by a pine cone, the attribute of Bacchus and the bacchantes.

On Andros and in Teos the temple springs were said to flow with wine instead of water every year on the occasion of the festival of Dionysus, whilst in Elis three cauldrons, set down empty, were later found to be full of wine.²

Samen aller Lebewesen." ... "Plut., de cup. div. 8, beschreibt die Dionysien kurz so: Ein Weinkrug, eine Rebe, ein Bock, ein Korb Feigen und dann der Phallus." FRAZER, *The Golden Bough*, V, Ch. I, pp. 1-34, Dionysus. "The god Dionysus or Bacchus is best known to us as a personification of the vine and of the exhilaration produced by the juice of the grape" (p. 2). See also SEESEMAN, *TWNT*, V, p. 163.

¹ EURIPIDES, *Bakchai*, 704-713: "The one took a thyrsus and struck a rock, from which water gushed forth. Another laid a narthex stem upon the flat ground and there the deity caused a fountain of wine to play. But all those who craved a white drink scratched the ground open with their finger-tips and were assuaged with streams of milk. And from the thyrsus wound round with ivy tendrils sweet streams of honey dripped, so that you, if you had been there, would at the sight of this have approached with prayers the deity whom you now belittle." HORACE, *Odes*, Book II, XIX, 5-12: "Evoe! My heart thrills with fear still fresh, and tumultuously rejoices, since my breast is full of the god. Evoe! Liber! Spare me, oh, spare me, thou god to be dreaded for thy mighty thyrsus! 'Tis meet for me to sing of the tireless Bacchanals, to tell of the fountains of wine, the rich streams of milk, and the honey distilling from hollow tree-trunks" (euhoe, recenti mens trepidat metu, plenoque Bacchi pectore turbidum laetatur. Euhoe, parce, Liber, parce, gravi metuende thyrsos. Fas pervicaces est mihi Thyiadas vinique fontem lactis et uberes cantare rivos atque truncis lapsa cavis iterare mella).

² PAUSANIAS, *Description of Greece*, VI, XXVI, 1, 2: "Between the market-place and the Menius is an old theatre and a shrine of Dionysus. The image is the work of Praxiteles. Of the gods the Eleans worship Dionysus with the greatest reverence, and they assert that the god attends their festival, the Thyia. The place where they hold the festival they name the Thyia is about eight stades from the city. Three pots are brought into the building by the priests and set down empty in the presence of the citizens and of any strangers who may chance to be in the country. The doors of the building are sealed by the priests themselves and by any others who may be so inclined. On the morrow they are allowed to examine the seals, and on going into the building they find the pots filled with wine. I did not myself arrive at the time of the festival, but the most respected Elean citizens, and with them strangers also, swore that what I have said is the truth. The Andrians too assert that every other year at their feast of Dionysus wine flows of its own accord from the sanctuary. If the Greeks are to be believed in these matters, one might with equal reason accept what the Aethiopians above Syene say about the table of the sun." ATHENAEUS, *The Deipnosophists*, I, 34a:

According to SAINTYVES it is certain that wine libation in springs and rivers is connected with a "fertility rite for the propagation of the grape." The changing of water into wine was not only a symbol, but had also to serve as a challenge and as a guarantee of a bountiful harvest!¹ SAINTYVES points to the characteristic fact that the wine miracle in the miraculous practices of the saints occurred in particular between 25 December and 6 January, whilst wine miracles also often happened at Easter. The wine needed for Mass was often created from water.² At Christmas the fountains flowed

"Theopompus of Chios relates that the vine was discovered in Olympia, on the banks of the Alpheius; and that there is a district in Elis a mile away, in which, at the festival of Dionysus, the inhabitants shut up and seal three empty cauldrons in the presence of visitors; later, they open the cauldrons and find them full of wine." (Transl. C. B. Gulick). PLINY, *Natural History*, II, CVI, 230, 231. "The slightly acid spring called Lyncestis makes men tipsy, like wine; the same occurs in Paphlagonia and in the territory of Cales. It is accredited by the Mucianus who was three times consul that the water flowing from a spring in the temple of Father Liber on the island of Andros always has the flavour of wine on January 5th: the day is called God's Gift Day." (Lyncestis aqua quae vocatur acidula vini modo temulentos facit; item in Paphlagonia et in agro Caleno. Andro in insula, templo Liberi patris, fontem nonis Januariis semper vini sapore fluere Mucianus ter consul credit; dies Θεοδοσια vocatur). DIODORUS OF SICILY, III, 66: "The Teans advance as proof that the god was born among them the fact that, even to this day, at fixed times in their city a fountain of wine, of unusually sweet fragrance, flows of its own accord from the earth." (—ἐν τῇ πόλει πηγὴν, αὐτομάτως ἐκ τῆς γῆς οἴνου ῥεῖν εὐωδίᾳ διαφέροντος). See further Plutarch, *Quaest. conv.*, V, 3. JUSTIN says in *Apol.*, 54, and in *Dial. cum Tryph.*, 69, that Dionysus was called "the inventor of the vine," εὐρετής ἀμπέλου. TERTULLIAN, *De Anima*, 50, referring to various wonderful kinds of water, includes among them the wine-like waters of Lyncestae (Macedonia), which can cause intoxication . . . GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 179, makes an interesting comment on the wine miracles. "We know that mechanical devices to produce miraculous effects were fairly common in antiquity, and they were probably used at Elis, as at Corinth. The fourth-century Christian writer Epiphanius tells us that in his day water was still turned into wine at Cibra in Caria and at Gerasa in Palestine. Unfortunately recent excavations suggest that the miracle at Gerasa not only was the continuation of an earlier pagan wonder, but was contrived by an elaborate system of pipe lines" (Grant refers to A. de Rochas, *L'art des thaumaturges dans l'antiquité* (ed. 2, Paris, 1922); C. Bonner, *A Dionysiac Miracle at Corinth*, *AJA* 33 (1929), 368-75, and C. H. Kraeling, *Gerasa City of the Decapolis* (New Haven, 1938), 63, 212).

¹ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 216: "Le changement de l'eau en vin par le versement du vin dans une fontaine ou dans un cours d'eau non seulement symbolisait, mais devait provoquer le changement de l'eau des pluies en jus de la grappe." The liturgy of Andros and Elis thus forms a kind of guarantee of the harvest.

² SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 206 f.: "Le trait du changement de l'eau en vin se retrouve dans de nombreux récits d'origine chrétienne où il a été utilisé à des fins assez diverses. Ce miracle a servi tantôt à faire resplendir la grandeur du sacrifice de la messe, tantôt à démontrer l'excellence du jeûne. Lorsque le vin manque

with wine instead of water in Brittany.¹ Russian peasants tell one another that at the first stroke from the great belfry of the Kremlin on Easter midnight all the waters of the whole earth, except among the unbelievers, are changed in one single moment into very choice wine.² According to a popular belief prevalent in various parts of France, brooks change at Easter into streams of wine.³ As we have already said, SAINTYVES is of the opinion that we are in essence concerned here with fertility rites, seasonal rites, in which wonder and symbol are interwoven, as is the case in the Biblical story, according to the same writer.⁴

Analogous to the accounts of the changing of water into wine is the story of the changing of water into oil. EUSEBIUS states how a great miracle occurred through the instrumentality of Narcissus, the thirtieth Bishop of Jerusalem after the apostles. During the Easter night watch the deacons had a shortage of oil. Narcissus commanded those who had to look after the lights to draw water and bring it to him. He pronounced a prayer over this water and ordered that it be poured into the lamps. "And when they had done this, the nature of the water changed through an ineffable divine miraculous power into that of oil, and many of the brethern there have since preserved a little of that oil as proof of the miracle that happened then."⁵

Various scholars are of the opinion that the account in Jn. 2 is connected with the cult of Dionysus and must perhaps be regarded as opposition to the god of wine. We shall return to this point.

pour la célébration des 'saints mystères,' nous voyons saint Ulric, saint David de Menève, saint Thomas des Camaldules, saint Pierre Célestin, changer l'eau en vin. Saint Léonard, ayant donné à un pauvre le vin destiné au Saint sacrifice, obtient que l'eau soit changée en vin . . . C'était une chose assez ordinaire que l'eau que l'on servait à saint Gui de Pompose se changeât en vin. De grands prélats l'ont constaté avec admiration."

¹ Op. cit., p. 219: "En Basse-Bretagne l'eau des fontaines se change en vin pendant la messe de Noël et plus précisément au moment de la consécration."

² Op. cit., p. 222.

³ Op. cit., p. 223 f.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 229: "Symbole et miracle se rattachent incontestablement au vieux rite saisonnier de la multiplication du vin. Il est donc bien certain que ce trait particulier incite à penser que la légende du Christ s'est greffée sur une série de rites agraires analogues à ceux qui sont à la base des légendes d'Attis, d'Adonis, d'Osiris et de Dionysos. Ce n'est d'ailleurs qu'un point; mais lorsqu'on songe que les grandes dates de la vie de Jésus coïncident avec les solstices et les équinoxes, cela donne à penser et permet de se demander dans quelle mesure se mêle dans une telle vie le mythe et la légende."

⁵ EUSEBIUS, *Hist. eccles.*, VI, IX, 2, cf. V, XII, 2.

(c) *Explanations*

In all kinds of ways, including some which are without doubt very ingenious, efforts have been made to render the account of the wedding at Cana rationally acceptable.

1. Naturalistic explanations. In this kind of explanation we find a remarkable variation, whilst the psychological moment plays an important part among some. PAULUS does not have the slightest difficulty with the story. In his opinion this is neither a miracle nor deceit, but a well-meant act to enhance the festive spirit at the wedding. Mary knew that Jesus was to give wine as a wedding present, but she felt that He was taking too long in handing it over! According to PAULUS this was therefore a friendly gift with a mysterious way of presenting it, connected with the circumstances of a wedding.¹ VON AMMON also has a wedding present in mind.² These explanations are thus based on the idea that Jesus had in fact brought wine with Him.

The explanation changes when this is not supposed and the water in the pots is regarded as water. The solution is then not sought in the change of the water, but in a "change" in the spirit of the wedding guests! Here again various possibilities occur. According to SCHÄFER a psychiatrist, Jesus was capable of imposing suggestion on the masses. In this case we have a model of hypnotic suggestion. Both the miracle of the loaves and this one, says SCHÄFER, can be explained only in this way. In the days of Strauss "the theory and practice of hypnotism slumbered."³ DE RÉGLA, a doctor, supposes a double influence, viz. firstly that of the wine and secondly that of Jesus when He cried out to the guests: "Drink, for ye have here a wine better than that which ye have drunk!"⁴

All these naturalistic explanations, enriched with psychological infiltrations, are unsatisfactory and disputable; too much has to be postulated before exegesis can begin.

2. Reference has already been made to STRAUSS' mythical explanation and GREBER's spiritualistic one.

¹ PAULUS, *Commentar über das Neue Testament*, IV, I, p. 151 ff.

² VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 305 ff. . . . K. H. Venturini shares this view. Jesus had brought with Him a few jars of good wine as a wedding present and had put them aside in a room. When John wrote his Gospel as an old man, he confused matters. See SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 45.

³ SCHÄFER, *Jesus in psychiatrischer Beleuchtung*, p. 65.

⁴ DE RÉGLA, *Jésus de Nazareth*, p. 123.

3. The explanation derived from the history of religions. A number of scholars consider that the account in John 2 comes from foreign soil. SAINTYVES — see above — believes that we are concerned here with the widespread body of seasonal rites. The majority think specifically of the cult of Dionysus. DIBELIUS is of the opinion that John suitably “dressed up” the originally extra-Christian story.¹ According to BULTMANN there is no doubt that the theme of the story, viz. the changing of water into wine, is a characteristic theme of the Dionysus legend: “in which this very miracle is the miracle of the epiphany of the deity and therefore is dated at the time of the festival of Dionysus, viz. the night of 5 January.”²

SCHMIDT says that there may in fact have been a Christ-Dionysus, just as there was also a Christ-Orpheus. He also recalls the worship of Osiris as the water of life. There is a tradition which says that water drawn from the Nile on 6 January changes into wine.³

As others do, SCHMIDT points not only to the supposed Christ-Dionysus relation, but also to the fact that Philo of Alexandris called the Logos allegorically the “wine-pourer.” How did Philo come by this expression? Referring to finds in a temple in Corinth dating back to the fifth century B.C. which are said to demonstrate the occurrence of Dionysian “wine miracles,” BARRETT believes that some readers of the Gospel of John were definitely aware of these, whilst Philo would also know about them. Now Philo made an allegory of the story of Melchizedek, Genesis 14. He speaks of Mel-

¹ DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 98 f.: “Aber in dieser Verkleidung hat sich mehr oder minder fragmentarisch eine Erzählung erhalten, die ursprünglich gewiss von einem göttlichen oder halbgöttlichen Wundertäter erzählt und von diesem das für seine Epiphanie bezeichnende Weinwunder berichtete; man denke an Dionysos oder eine verwandte Gottheit. Diese Erzählung wurde auf Jesus übertragen und so entstand die Jesus-‘Novelle,’ die der Evangelist bearbeitete und seinen Gedanken dienstbar machte.”

² BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 83: “In der alten Kirche ist diese Verwandtschaft noch verstanden worden, wenn man das Fest der Taufe Christi als seine Epiphanie auf den 6. Januar setzte, und ebenso, wenn man den 6. Januar für den Tag der Hochzeit von Kana hielt.” See also SEESEMAN, *TWNT*, V, p. 163 ff. ROBERTSON, *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 356 ff.

³ K. L. SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 43, with reference to Karl Holl, *Der Ursprung des Epiphanien-festes*, SBA 1917, p. 402 ff.: “Nach einer Nachricht des Epiphanien (haec. 51, 30, 3: ed. Holl II, S. 301, 14 ff.) bestand im heidnischen Ägypten der Brauch, am 6 Januar Nilwasser zu schöpfen, das dem Volksglauben gemäss sich in Wein verwandeln sollte. Das mag die Erzählung vom Wunder zu Kana, die als erste ‘Offenbarung der Herrlichkeit’ Jesu eine der Lektionen der Epiphaniaszeit geworden ist, als Evangelium eben dieser Zeit in Ägypten besonders beliebt gemacht haben.”

chizedek as of the Logos, says BARRETT: "probably because he saw an opportunity of showing the roots of Hellenistic religion in Judaism: not Dionysus but the Logos, of whom Melchizedek is a symbol, is the true miraculous dispenser of divine inspiration."¹

The Dionysus-Christ relation may be regarded as characteristic of Jn. 2, whilst moreover stress may be laid on the antithesis. For the Dionysian cult, as a dangerous, competitive religion, had to be combated with might and main. Elsewhere in the New Testament traces of this combating are said to be visible.²

Now it must be admitted that it is not impossible and inconceivable that the author of the fourth Gospel was acquainted with the cult of Dionysus; but did he use this foreign matter to attribute a wine miracle to Jesus, too? Even if this is assumed, it will have to be asked, as SCHMIDT does, in what way this material penetrated the Gospel.³

4. The account is accepted as historical.

Even when the historicity of the event recounted in Jn. 2 : 1-11

¹ BARRETT, St. John. For the wine miracles in the temple in Corinth Barrett refers to G. Bonner, *American Journal of Archaeology*, XXXIII (1929), pp. 368-375 . . . Philo says in his *Leg. all.*, III, 82, that Melchizedek: "brings wine instead of water and drenches the souls with wine" (ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Μελχισεδέκ ἀντὶ ὕδατος οἶνον προσφερέτω καὶ ποτιζέτω καὶ ἀκρατιζέτω ψυχάς—). In *Somn.*, II, 249, he calls the Logos: "Wine-pourer of God and master of ceremonies" (οἰνοχόος τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ συμποσίαρχος). Barrett says that in this passage Philo quite clearly uses pagan examples. "Thus there existed Jewish precedent for speaking of the Logos in pseudo-Dionysiac terminology, and John may have done this; it is even conceivable that the miracle story had a non-Christian origin. In style it stands a little apart from most of the Johannine material (Schweizer, 100; Introduction, p. 8) and may be extraneous matter lightly worked over and incorporated by John. But it is also related to the earlier gospel tradition."

² PREISKER, *Neutestam. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 164, note 2: "Den Gegensatz zum Dionysoskult deuten offensichtlich 1. Kor. 13, 1 ff.; Joh. 2, 1 ff. und 15, 1 ff. an, und Reste dionysischer Ausgelassenheit sind wohl in der Korinthergemeinde noch wach, 1 Kor. 11, 21." Cf. SCHNEIDER, *Einführung i.d. Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, p. 123 ff. JEANMAIRE, *Dionysos*, p. 479: "Le Christianisme, au cours de son expansion, a fatalement rencontré l'exercice des cultes dionysiaques dont les racines et les rejets poussaient encore vigoureusement dans les premiers siècles de notre ère" . . . Jeanmaire attributes the downfall of the cult of Dionysus to the fact that the religion of Christ moved man himself more deeply than that of Dionysus. The cult of Dionysus had its propagandists, but it had no martyrs. It was a: "religion sans docteurs, parce que presque sans doctrine." There never was an "église dionysiaque." See p. 479 f.

³ K. L. SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 43: "Schwierig ist die Frage, wie solche Einflüsse vermittelt zu denken sind. Man wird die verschiedensten Möglichkeiten zu erwägen haben, die direkte Beeinflussung, den Weg über das hellenistische Judentum und den über die Mysterien. Vielleicht bilden bei der Bildung des Kanastoffes synoptische Jesusworte (vgl. Mk. 2, 19-22) den Einschlag in dem Gewebe der synkretischen Vorstellungen."

is maintained, various views are possible. NEANDER believes that the water was not changed into ordinary wine, but that the force of the water was increased, strengthened, to that of wine. A kind of synthetic wine, in other words?¹ Following in the footsteps of Augustine, some have thought of an accelerated natural process: in a moment's time a process occurred in the water during the wedding which otherwise takes a long period in the vine.² Is this an attempt to salvage a certain "natural" element to make the event more acceptable and comprehensible?

When the account is taken as a factual one, only one conclusion is possible, namely that a material change took place in the water and water did in fact become wine, as the text of Jn. 4 : 46 puts it: "So Jesus came again into Cana of Galilee, where he made the water wine."³

¹ NEANDER, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 272: "Wir sind aber keineswegs berechtigt anzunehmen, dass das Wasser in *dasselbe*, was aus dem Gewächse des Weinstocks bereitet wird, verwandelt werden; sondern wir brauchen nur anzunehmen, dass er durch seine unmittelbare Einwirkung dem Wasser eine solche höhere Kraft, durch welche es dieselben Wirkungen, wie starker Wein, hervorbringen konnte, mitgeteilt, oder dass er die Kraft des Wassers zu der des Weines potenziert habe."

² TRENCH, *Notes on the Miracles*, p. 105 f., with reference to AUGUSTINE, *In Ev. Joh. Tract.*, 8: "Ipse enim fecit vinum illo die in nuptiis in sex illis hydriis quas impleri aqua praecepit, qui omni anno facit hoc in vitibus. Sicut enim quod miserunt ministri in hydrias, in vinum conversum est opere Domini, sic et quod nubes fundunt, in vinum convertitur eiusdem opere Domini. Illud autem non miramur, quia omni anno fit: assiduitate amisit admirationem" . . . STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 221, rejects this view, which we find for instance in Ols-hausen too.

³ CLAUSING, *De mens in de knoop*, has devoted particular attention to the miracle at Cana. He comments that John 2 : 9 speaks "unambiguously" of the changing of water into wine. "To put this in modern terms, water (H₂O) was therefore converted in any case into alcohol (C₂H₅OH). This is of course only possible if the C atoms of the alcohol were created from the H₂O molecules by some transformation or the other" (p. 197). In Appendix I, pp. 315-317, Clausing erects from all kind of "evidence" a structure in which it is demonstrated that the miracle at Cana is not true, and why this is so. It is not possible here to analyse the Appendix, which is disputable on many points, and not as "valuable" as the author, a doctor of physics and a bachelor of theology, himself believes (p. 197). When Clausing asserts that something is "of course only possible if . . .," and then puts forward a few chemical formulae, he is correct, as long as he observes nature in its behaviour as a physicist and tries to formulate this behaviour as "natural," but he gets hopelessly tied up when he tries to use this observation and these formulae to regulate and bind God, heaven and earth! (Cf. the chapter: *Miracles and Science*.) A challenge to those who wish to maintain the factuality of the miracle at Cana, consisting of "a well-documented protocol of the wedding (as it were with the results of the chemical analyses and the photographs attached)" (p. 197), is utter nonsense.

5. Symbolic explanations. At a very early stage it was wondered what deeper meaning lay behind the miracle at Cana. As we have said on several occasions, it is possible to practise symbolism whilst retaining historicity, but striking symbolic perspectives can likewise be discovered whilst the question of historicity is considered of no importance at all.¹ Moreover, the one investigator has a greater gift for ingenuity and a more vivid imagination than the other, and he will also be able to discover richer symbolic values in the details.

We shall begin by extracting a few details. The words "the third day," Jn. 2 : 1, were interpreted by SCHMIDT in 1921 simply as an indication of time without any significance, whereas DODD in 1953 saw a deep symbolism in them, the remarkable thing being that they both attribute a symbolic significance to the whole!² We mentioned the years on purpose, so that it can be seen from them that there is no question in symbolic exegesis of scientific progression, but that it goes its own way, viz. that of the individual fertility of invention of the investigator, cutting right through all further exegetic work. Only when symbolic exegesis is rooted in objective data or itself emerges as an objective datum of the Bible can it make an illuminating, scientific contribution to a better understanding of the sources.

We have already spoken of the deeper meaning which is attached to Jesus' words "mine hour is not yet come."

The six stone water pots, containing two or three firkins, which were set there "after the manner of the purifying of the Jews," have been the subject of searching reflections. ORIGEN, pondering the numbers, already voiced the surmise that the two or three firkins

¹ WOOLSTON, Discourses on the Miracles: Fourth Discourse, p. (50), calls the account: "an absurd and offensive Story according to the Letter."

² K. L. SCHMIDT, op. cit., p. 33. The words "the third day" designate a "Perikopen-Initium," "das denselben Wert hat wie ein farbloses 'hiernach,' 'in jener Zeit.' Daher ist es auch unstatthaft, einen tieferen symbolischen Sinn in der Erwähnung gerade des dritten Tages zu finden." DODD, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, p. 300: "The difficulty of basing a convincing chronology of events upon this datum is notorious. But the 'third day' was in Christian tradition from earliest times the day when Christ manifested His glory in resurrection from the dead. It is in accordance with the view taken by this evangelist that the whole of the incarnate ministry of the Word should have the character of the 'third day' of His glory." We may comment that SCHMIDT says: "Meines Erachtens spricht die Eigenart des Kana-Stoffes für seine Ungeschichtlichkeit" (op. cit., p. 42), while DODD argues: "The story, then, is not to be taken at its face value. Its true meaning lies deeper" (op. cit., p. 297).

relate to the word of Scripture in its twofold or threefold form, whilst the six relates to the creation in six days.¹ However, the pots themselves are considered more significant than the numbers. The water was ready so that the guests could cleanse themselves in accordance with the regulations. Might then the water in the pots not be the symbol of the old law, whilst the wine was meant to depict the fiery force of the gospel?²

The above example, the third which we have mentioned in the symbolism of the details — SCHMIDT thinks that the first readers of the story of the wedding at Cana perhaps saw allegories everywhere, and the Evangelist presumably had no objection to his text being explained allegorically down to minor details (sic!) — may form the introduction to a survey of recent views on the story as a whole. K.L. SCHMIDT is of the opinion that the deeper meaning of the account lies in the polemic against the disciples of John regarding baptism, cf. Jn. 1 : 26, 33. "The cleansing water of the Baptist is changed into the wine of the spirit."³ It is CULLMANN's opinion that not

¹ De Principiis, IV, 2, 5. The words about the Jews "inwardly" (Rom. 2 : 29) mean that the Jews "are cleansed by the words of Holy Writ, which sometimes contains two metretes, so to speak: the psychical and spiritual word, but sometimes three, as some, apart from the aforementioned, also have the physical word, with the power to edify them. Further there are in reason six water-pots for those who are cleansed in the world, which came into being in six days, the complete number." Cf. BARRETT, St. John: "It is possible though by no means certain that the number six is symbolic: cf. on 21.11. Six, being less by one than seven, the number of completeness and perfection, would indicate that the Jewish dispensation, typified by its ceremonial water, was partial and imperfect. Perhaps it should be noted that the event took place on the sixth day (see on 2.1); on the other hand, no numerical interpretation of the miracle can be entirely satisfactory since Jesus does not create a seventh vessel."

² K. L. SCHMIDT, op. cit., p. 40 f.: "Das Wasser ist das Sinnbild des jüdischen Ritus mit seinem Reinigungswesen. Der Wein ist das Evangelium mit seinem Feuergeist. Das Alte wird von dem Neuen abgelöst. Es mag hier der Gegensatz zwischen nomos und charis wie er 1, 17 vorliegt, mitschwingen. Solche Polemik gegen das Judentum ist ja ein Hauptgeschäft im vierten Evangelium." Cf. SMITH, Ecce Deus, p. 124. CULLMANN, Urchristentum u. Gottesdienst, p. 45, points with approval to the: "gottesdienstliche Beziehung unserer Geschichte," demonstrated by Schmidt, even though Schmidt's final conclusion differs from Cullmann's. KEULERS, Joannes, mentions a similar interpretation by Lagrange. But BULTMANN, Das Evangelium des Johannes, will not hear of this symbolism. Bultmann thinks that in John polemics against the Jewish law plays no part (p. 84, note 2).

³ SCHMIDT, op. cit., p. 41: "Das Reinigungswasser des Täufers wird in den Wein des Geistes verwandelt. Dadurch finden die Jünger Jesu, die ehemaligen Täuferjünger, den Glauben an Jesus. Das ist der Sinn davon, dass Jesus den Wein spendet. Man kann weiter gehen: Jesus ist der Wein . . ." When Jesus says that he is the vine, the life, the light, the truth, we are in the field of religious identifications. "Wir befinden uns hier im Bereich religiöser Identifikationen—Christus

baptism but Communion, the blood of Christ, is meant, an idea shared by BARRETT.¹ DODD's view deviates from the sacramental line: he considers it possible, and certainly more important, that here the wine of the law, the Torah, is contrasted with the true wine, which Christ gives.²

Finally, JEREMIAS' opinion. According to this exegete the wine is the symbol of the coming reign of salvation. JEREMIAS says that he encounters this symbolism in the imagery of the Bible and he is of the opinion that the disciples understood that their Lord was manifesting Himself as Renovator of the world when He offered them as His first sign "the vintage of the aeon of salvation."³

But BULTMANN has pronounced his veto on all these symbolic

ist das, was er spendet." CLAVIER, *Les sens multiples dans le Nouveau Testament*, does not wish entirely to exclude the possibility of: "le souvenir d'un incident de ce genre qui se serait effectivement passé au début du ministère de Jésus." But the author: "joue avec virtuosité" on: "toute une gamme de significations et de suggestions." "La mère de Jésus pourrait être Marie, et, en même temps, la tradition juive, 'l'Eglise juive' qui l'a nourri. Il peut y avoir eu de l'eau, chimiquement H₂O, et, dans cet eau, le judaïsme de Moïse, celui de Jean-Baptiste, le précurseur, avec son baptême qui n'est que d'eau. Il peut y avoir eu réellement du vin, du fruit de la vigne, comme celui de la Cène, et, dans ce vin, l'Evangile, la Nouvelle Alliance, le sang de la nouvelle alliance" (p. 189).

¹ CULLMANN, op. cit., p. 45: "Wasser dient bis dahin zu Reinigungsriten der Juden. An Stelle aller dieser Riten tritt nunmehr der Abendmahlswein, das Blut Christi. Die Reinigung von den Sünden erfolgt jetzt nicht mehr durch Befolgung jener Vorschriften, sondern im Abendmahl, in dem Christus, das 'Lamm Gottes,' die Vergebung der Sünden durch seinen Kreuzestod den Gläubigen anbietet. Däs ist das andere Kanawunder, auf das im materiellen Wunder hingewiesen wird." BARRETT, op. cit., p. 160: "... this incident illustrates at once the poverty of the old dispensation with its merely ceremonial cleansing and the richness of the new, in which the blood of Christ is available both for cleansing (1. 29) and for drink (6. 53)." Cf. BRANDT, *Das ewige Wort*. GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 170, shares Cullmann's view ... Come to that, we already find this view in IRENAEUS, *Adv. haereses*, III, 16, 7; see also III, 11, 5.

² DODD, op. cit., p. 84: "... as Christ gives ἀληθινὸς ἄρτος, so also he gives οἶνος ἀληθινός, while the Torah offers only the shadow." BOISMARD, op. cit., p. 140 f., remarks that Jesus gave the wine: "au cours d'un banquet." Referring to Pro. 9 : 1-5 and Isa. 55 : 1-2, he points out that here it is "Wisdom" that speaks invitingly. He wonders: "si Jo., I, 35 ss. suppose comme arrière-plan des textes comme Prov., 8, 17, 34 ss., quoi de plus normal que d'interpréter Jo., 2, 1 ss. en fonction de Prov., 9, 1-5? ... Jésus apporte alors le vin nouveau, la bonne Parole venue de Dieu, l'enseignement de la véritable Sagesse."

³ J. JEREMIAS, *Jesus als Weltvollender*, p. 28: "Der Wein ist in der Sprache der Bibel das Symbol der Heilszeit." "Das Kana-Wunder ist die erste Bekundung der Hoheit Jesu als Welterneuerer (Doxa) in der Bildsprache der Bibel" (p. 29). But see SEESEMAN, *TWNT*, V, p. 165, note 18: "Dass der Wein Symbol der Heilszeit sei, ist den Quellen nicht zu entnehmen, gegen J. Jeremias, *Jesus als Weltvollender* (1930) 27-31."

interpretations! In his opinion the origin of the Johannine miracle story must only be sought in the Dionysus cult in Syria.¹

After this extensive reconnaissance, in which we have encountered a number of very divergent views and explanations, it may be asked whether all possibilities are now exhausted. Following a trail blazed by a number of investigators, we shall now consider a number of data more closely.

(d) *Possibilities and conclusions*

It will be immediately clear that in Jn. 2 : 1-11 we are not concerned with a matter-of-fact report, a protocol, but with an adaptation. This in no way means that this adaptation does not contain a "historical nucleus," although it must be considered impossible to establish the extent of this nucleus. If the story was originally a parable, as some believe, or if it is perhaps based on the misunderstanding of something said, to what is its present form due?²

An important remark in Jn. 4 : 46 is the following: "So Jesus came again into Cana of Galilee, where he made the water wine." If this is compared with Jn. 12: 1: "Then Jesus six days before the Passover came to Bethany, where Lazarus was which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead," it is seen that in both cases John endeavoured to add colour to his topography by recalling startling events. For it cannot but be assumed that the author was certain that the two miracles related by him had in fact taken place and that they were important enough to be mentioned again.

With regard to the objections made to the miracle, we may say

¹ BULTMANN, op. cit., p. 84, notes 1 and 2.

² One can hold the view that everything happened exactly as Jn. 2 : 1-11 recounts it. But one can also believe in an actual event of which tradition has lost sight of the details. Cf. BERNARD, St. John. "Jn. certainly implies that some objective change took place in the water served for drinking purposes (cf. 4. 46) . . . In short the way in which the story is told goes far to support the view that it is a genuine reminiscence, or tradition, of an actual occurrence, although it is impossible now to discern exactly what took place." Bernard rejects the idea of an original parable, as for instance E. A. Abbot suggests, but considers it not improbable that the account originated from a "misunderstanding!" "The case for treatment of the whole story as due to a misunderstanding of some figurative saying can be put more plausibly." Cf. K. L. SCHMIDT, op. cit., p. 42 f.: "Man hat die Wurzel der Kana-Tradition darin sehen wollen, dass Jesus an einer Hochzeit teilnahm, welches Ereignis dann zu begründen gewesen sei. Hierbei kommt aber die Hauptsache, das Weinwunder, zu kurz. Gangbarer ist der Weg, das Weinwunder aus einem Gleichnis Jesu abzuleiten. Greifbarer aber sind ausser-biblische Parallelen."

the following. As regards the objection to the event as such, the fact itself, we believe that this must be regarded as unfounded, in other words it may not be questioned whether Jesus could or could not have performed such a feat! Anyone who doubts the wine miracle because it appears so "impossible" must bear in mind that such an objection can be made to all other miracles. The fact itself, viz. the changing of water into wine, cannot therefore be taken into account or used as a criterion in judging this miracle. The situation is different with a second objection to which we already referred at the beginning of this chapter, viz. the objection to the "peculiar" nature of the miracle, which arouses the annoyance of many. Can we, who live in an entirely different time and under other circumstances, still approach the account of this miracle so closely that we can understand Jesus' deed as a revelation of His "glory?" For this understanding is what matters. SCHMIDT has given us a useful hint by emphasizing that it is not verse 10 but verse 11 that contains the point of the story. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth his glory; and his disciples believed on him." At the same time SCHMIDT has rightly said that the statement of the changing of the water into wine forms the essence of the account. For this reason he does not consider it correct to turn Jesus into a good-natured wine-pourer, who helps His host out of an embarrassing situation! ¹

The emotional arguments handed down from generation to generation in many commentaries, and relating to Jesus' sympathetic nature, His humane accommodating spirit, etc., have clouded our view of the essence of His doxa, His glory.

On several occasions we have pointed out that one must be alive to the situation, that the facts must be regarded in a matter-of-fact fashion. In Jn. 2 : 1-11 the situation is reported as follows: a wedding feast is being held, whose success is endangered through the absence of wine. This is evident from the matter-of-fact statement by Mary to her son: "They have no wine." Her second matter-of-fact statement was made to the servants: "Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it." Many have tried to seek Mary's thoughts and emotions, her motives

¹ SCHMIDT, op. cit., p. 38. The point of v. 10 is: "keine rechte Pointe. Sie ist ganz profan . . . Der erhabene Ton kommt erst in Vers 11 zum Ausdruck." The essential thing is the change into wine. "Denn das ist das Wesentliche, auf das es dem Evangelisten ankommt. Die Überschrift 'Jesus der (gütige) Weinspender' ist keine ausreichende Erklärung. Ausschlaggebend ist vielmehr die Verwandlung und damit auch das Element, das verwandelt wird."

and desires behind these two statements. Her instructions to the servants certainly suggest that she expected help from Jesus in some way or the other. Beyond that, care should be taken with surmises! We have already said that BULTMANN rightly opposes the various psychological interpretations, although he himself wrongly falls back on his favourite theory: "the style of the miracle story."¹

Jesus' initial refusal — nothing is known about the lapse of time between Mary's instructions to the servants and Jesus' command — must be understood in the light of Jesus' attitude with respect to both His relatives and strangers: the Son's time is not determined by the wishes or hints of man, but by the Father in Heaven. When the "hour" had come the water changed into wine. All speculations on the manner in which this happened, the kind of wine and the exact quantity, etc., are doomed to fruitlessness. As a miracle it is just as credible (countless will say incredible!) as Jesus' other miracles. DE ZWAAN rightly says: "The wine miracle at Cana does not differ in outward nature from the Synoptic miraculous feeding, which John also relates in 6 : 1-15."² The fact that Jesus performed the miracle in His "hour" is difficult to reconcile with the idea that the wine miracle was performed merely to help a host out of his embarrassment. It contains much more, and we must not try to interpret this "much more" by means of symbolism, but must endeavour to understand the situation as it then was for men and as Jesus saw it, since He lived in it! We who try to interpret an "obscure" account of a miracle 2000 years later must be alive to time and environment, to climate and atmosphere, to the essential background of the event. However strange it may sound and however difficult it may be for many, we shall have to have an open ear for the Biblical song of praise on wine as the gift of God, "that maketh glad the heart of man," Psalms 104 : 15, and we shall have to bear in mind that wine was not a luxury, but an ordinary drink.³ We shall have to

¹ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

² DE ZWAAN, *Inleiding tot het N.T.*, I, p. 143. De Zwaan says this to disprove the assertion that it is precisely John who adduces traditions which "accentuate the miracle."

³ When consulting and collecting textual material the investigator is sometimes remarkably handicapped by the fact that intellectual development, dogmatic principles and moral ties have as it were formed a preselective system in the mind, which unconsciously and instinctively performs its function right through the investigation! Note the way in which exegetes overlook, fight sky of, or play down those texts which may endanger their hypothesis or system. Note the way in which the teetotal theologian approaches the "wine texts" . . . Besides the

remember that Jesus, in contrast to John the Baptist, who abstained from wine and strong drink, see Lk. 1 : 15, 7 : 33, did not abstain; in fact, He was even called a "winebibber," Mt. 11 : 19, Lk. 7 : 34. The miracle at Cana is rooted in Jesus' positive attitude towards the joy of living; it is the product and the proof of His positive attitude towards the natural human values of life.¹ It demonstrates that He "dwelt among us," Jn. 1 : 14, in the everyday things of life as well, and it is significant that this is revealed in this manner at the "beginning of miracles."²

As regards the *modus operandi*, there is a striking similarity between Jesus' method in many healing miracles and this miracle. We repeatedly read that Jesus did not want the healings which He performed to become known. We see the same here: Jesus performs the miracle in secret. He gives commands, but does not say what

many texts warning against the immoderate and unrestrained drinking of wine (Pro. 23 : 31-33; Isa. 5 : 11, 12, 22; 28 : 7; Hos. 4 : 11; 1 Co. 6 : 10, Eph. 5 : 18; 1 Tim. 3 : 3, etc.), we find texts in which wine is praised (in Ex. 29 : 38-41 and Nu. 15 : 2-10 wine is mentioned as a libation; 2 Sa. 16 : 2; Ecc. 9 : 7; 10 : 19; Isa. 25 : 6; 55 : 1; Jer. 48 : 33; Zech. 10 : 7, etc.). The vineyard's praises are sung and Israel is compared with a vineyard, Isa. 5 : 1-7. The vine plays an important part literally and figuratively, see among others Ps. 80, Jn. 15 : 1 ff. Cf. SEESEMAN, TWNT, V, p. 163 ff. GROSHEIDE, op. cit. "Moreover, it should not be forgotten that in Palestine wine was not just a luxury article, but formed the ordinary drink, and there were a large number of guests."

¹ UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes*. "Greater than the strict ideal of the Baptist is the pure joy of him who was called 'winebibber' . . . He enhances the way of life (15, 11; 17, 13), renews the force, changes a deficiency into an abundance (cf. 10, 10)." HERDER, *Von Gottes Sohn*, p. 311. Christ's first miracle is: "ein fröhliches Wunder, und zeichnet sich damit sogleich von der Lebensweise Johannes aus." SMELIK, *De weg van het Woord*. "He, Christ, does not demand that his disciples live as ascetics, in celibacy . . . The mission that forms their life must be performed in the midst of the world, its cares and delights, its mourning and its festivities . . . Christ enjoyed this miracle in the deepest sense. It pleased him. It was his pleasure, depicted in worldly splendour. It was the picture of his most essential property; on one occasion he was to say: I am the true vine (15 : 1)."

² The word "beginning" refers not only to an order of time, which would merely cause it to mean that this was the "first sign," but also to a principium, as GROSHEIDE, *Johannes*, rightly remarks. "ἀρχή is not only initium, but definitely principium. What follows proceeds to a certain extent from the first." Grosheide regards the miracle at Cana as characteristic of the following miracles. "Here we have an explanation of what the issue is, of what we have to look out for. The miracle must be accepted in faith." Grosheide consequently rejects the allegoric view . . . Cf. BARRETT, op. cit. The miracle is "not merely the first sign but 'a primary sign,' because representative of the creative and transforming work of Jesus as a whole." DELLING, TWNT, I, p. 481. ἀρχή here means: "das zeitliche Erstgeschehen in einer Reihe entsprechender oder gleicher Ereignisse."

is happening. The governor of the feast and the bridegroom are not informed.

Although from the words "and manifested forth his glory" the idea may be derived that the wonderful feat later became known in a wider circle, there is no point in going more deeply into this, since the text merely says what it meant to the disciples: they "believed on him." The miracle revealed Jesus' power and majesty to the disciples; it made His "glory" visible and concrete.¹ STAUFFER strikingly says that the wine miracle is a "miracle of revelation;" it is "the first step on the way to historical unfolding of the glory of the Son."² And BARRETT rightly remarks that the manifestations of Jesus' glory were rare and were not bestowed on everyone (cf. Jn. 11 : 4), but "a partial and preliminary manifestation was granted that the disciples might believe."³ The disciples were permitted in this way

¹ δόξα, **כְּבוֹד**, gloria, can be translated by fame, honour, lustre, splendour, majesty, power, glory. BAUER, Griech.-deu. Wörterbuch, rightly points out that in Jn. 2 : 11: "ist deutl. d. Begriff der Kraft, Macht mitgedacht." KITTEL, TWNT, II, p. 250 ff., remarks that it is common knowledge that the use of δόξα in the New Testament corresponds not to Greek usage, but to the usage of the Septuagint. The essence lies: "in der Aussage von der göttlichen Wesensart." BLUMHARDT, Schriftauslegung, p. 70: "Auch die Jünger Jesu hatten wohl voraus etwas Glauben, als sie Jesum sahen und hörten (Joh. 1, 41. 49 ff.); aber erst als der Herr das grosse Wunder zu Kana getan und damit seine Herrlichkeit geoffenbart hatte, heisst es (Joh. 2, 11): 'Und Seine Jünger glaubten an Ihn.' Grundlegende Offenbarungen also lassen sich gar nicht denken ohne Wunder. Denn Gott muss für Seine Offenbarungen mit Seiner Person, Seiner Allmacht eintreten." MENOUD, La Signification du Miracle dans le Nouveau Testament, p. 183: "Le signe accompli par Jésus 'révèle sa gloire' à ses disciples, c'est-à-dire leur révèle l'identité de sa personne, et les attache à lui définitivement par la foi. Bref le miracle est un acte de révélation et non un prodige de thaumaturgie. Ici encore c'est la portée théologique du miracle qui lui donne son vrai sens."

² STAUFFER, TWNT, I, p. 654: "Nicht die Hochzeit ist dem Erzähler wichtig (vgl. 4. 46), sondern das *σημεῖον*, das über sich hinausweist auf die δόξα des Sohnes. Das Weinwunder ist Offenbarungs-Wunder, wie das Brotwunder (6, 26) und alle joh Wunder. Es ist der erste Schritt auf dem Wege der geschichtlichen Entfaltung der Sohnesherrlichkeit." RENGSTORF, TWNT, VII, p. 244: the miraculous feeding and the miracle at Cana indicate that the Messianic time will bring the end of hunger and thirst. VAN DEN BUSSCHE, Het boek der tekens, p. 212. The abundant wealth of the aeon of salvation is adumbrated in the wine miracle.

³ BARRETT, op. cit. "The hour had not come for manifesting his glory; yet, as indeed in all the signs, a partial and preliminary manifestation was granted that the disciples might believe." . . . For "believing" in John, see BULTMANN, TWNT, VI, p. 224 ff. . . . John speaks of the "glory" of Jesus during His earthly life as well. However, this doxa is disclosed only to faith. "Es ist also auch bei Johannes keineswegs an und für sich an Jesus die δόξα sichtbar, sowenig wie bei den Synoptikern. Das Geheimnis seiner Person muss hier wie dort 'enthüllt' Mt 16, 17 und geglaubt werden," says KITTEL, TWNT, II, p. 252. Cf. SEVENSTER,

to perceive something of the truth of Jesus' vow: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man," Jn. 1 : 51. Belief in the sense of believing the words of Jesus develops into personal belief in the Speaker of that word. Believing becomes "come to me, that ye may have life," Jn. 5 : 40, 6 : 37; it becomes self-surrender, which is answered by Jesus with His self-revelation, Jn. 14 : 21-24.

To sum up, we may say:

- (a) Jn. 2 : 1-11 creates the impression of an independent account. It need be derived neither from Old Testament themes, nor from foreign data, particularly that of the Dionysus cult, although the author was certainly acquainted with the first, and perhaps with the second. Jn. 2 : 1-11 does not depict a bacchantic feast; nor does it express any struggle between Jesus and Dionysus, as SCHNEIDER has emphatically claimed.¹
- (b) The "sign" of the miracle, stated in the text itself, relates to the revelation of Jesus' glory, i.e. the manifestation of His divine power, His Messianic kingship. Sober reflection on the situation teaches us that the things of the everyday, natural life of man were close to Jesus' heart, so that a wedding could form the setting for the revelation of Jesus' "glory." This obviates the objection of the "offensive" nature which some ascribe to this miracle — see above.
- (c) Having regard to the unique nature of the Gospel of John and the indications contained in other miracles related in that Gospel, it will be understood that attempts have likewise been made to find

De Christologie v.h. N.T., p. 329. Sevenster points out that the glory of the Johannine Christ revealed itself not only in mighty signs but also and equally in His Passion and on the cross. In this we see the paradoxical nature of Jesus' "glory" in John. Here we are not far from the Pauline Christ, cf. 1 Co. 2 : 8.

¹ SCHNEIDER, *Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums*, I, p. 141. In note 1, p. 141, Schneider says: "Hier wird kein Gleichnis erzählt, sondern ein Agon zwischen der Dionysischen und der christlichen 'Besessenheit' ausgekämpft, bei dem der neue Dionysos den alten überwindet. Die Waffe des Dionysos ist der berauschende Wein, die Christi sind die Sakramentelemente Wasser und 'wahrer' (kalos) Wein. Dass der Wein im A.T. auch Symbol Israels ist, hilft zum Verständnis des Johannes nichts." According to SCHNEIDER an interpretatio christiana of Dionysus, Heracles and other gods took place. In II, p. 279, he says: "Alles, was der Antike an Dionysos, Isis, Herakles, Mithras heilig war, ging in das Christusbild ein, aber es entstand immer wieder ein Christusbild, nicht ein Mischgebilde. Das Volk konnte seine alten lieben Götter alle in Christus wiederfinden, aber es betete doch nur einen an."

symbolic values in this miracle. It seems to us that every symbolic explanation in which efforts have been made to indicate and nominate the symbol is untenable. As the actual event consists in the changing of water into wine, i.e. in the transformation of — in the given situation — the less good into the better, the stress falls on the fact that Jesus, in His kingly dominion, has the power to “change” in whatsoever situation, at whatsoever place and at whatsoever time He wishes. The “changes” performed by Him in secret (!) are, to the faithful, “signs” which help to confirm and deepen their faith in Him.

XIV. THE MIRACULOUS FEEDING

The Synoptists and John all refer to the feeding of the "five thousand," whilst that of the "four thousand" occurs only in Matthew and Mark.¹ It is understandable that this account has always greatly exercised men's minds.

We wish to consider the many questions, difficulties and explanations by means of the following seven points.

- (a) The problem of the doublet.
- (b) Questions regarding place and time.
- (c) Details in the accounts.
- (d) Old Testament and rabbinical accounts of feedings.
- (e) Analogous stories among other peoples.
- (f) Different explanations.
- (g) Conclusions.

(a) *The problem of the doublet*

The first question which arises when reading the accounts is this: are we concerned here with two feedings or with one event which has been handed down in two ways? It is true that we note differences between the accounts of the feeding of the five thousand, but the four stories are unmistakably based on one tradition. Matters are different as regards the feeding of the four thousand. It is absent from Luke and John, and other numbers are given. In favour of the acceptance of two feedings are the following points: (a) the difference in the numbers of the loaves and fishes and of those present; (b) in the first feeding the initiative is taken by the disciples, at least in the Synoptists; in the second Jesus Himself takes the initiative; (c) Jesus reminds His disciples of two feedings, Mt. 16 : 9-12 and parallel passage.

The data which favour one event are the following: (a) the great similarity of the accounts; (b) the improbability that the disciples would have forgotten the first feeding so quickly. Consequently opinions differ among exegetes. Besides the many who adhere to

¹ Mt. 14 : 13-21; Mk. 6 : 31-44; Lk. 9 : 10-17; Jn. 6 : 1-13. Feeding of the four thousand: Mt. 15 : 29-39; Mk. 8 : 1-10. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 68, classifies the feeding as a "Novelle;" BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 231, classifies it among the "Wundergeschichten."

two feedings, ¹ there are likewise many who believe that one and the same event, or one and the same tradition respectively, forms the basis of both accounts. ² The consequence of the latter point of view is that Mt. 16 : 9-12 and Mk. 8 : 19-21 cannot be original. It seems to us that we do in fact have a doublet here. The idea that so much happened between the first and the second feeding that the memory of the first one faded seems to us inconceivable with regard to such an event. Nor is the difficulty avoided by trying to explain the close similarity in style by the fact that the similarity of subject gave rise to the use of the same form. Moreover, the number seven — seven loaves and seven baskets — is food for thought. ³ One event will have been handed down in various forms, and a highly divergent version will have given rise to a second story.

(b) *Questions regarding place and time*

Indications of place and time are scanty. Mt. 14 : 13 speaks of a "desert place," cf. Mk. 6 : 32. Lk. 9 : 10 mentions "Bethsaida;"

¹ FILLION, *Les Miracles de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, II, p. 31; KEULERS, *Mattheüs*; VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*; GOULD, *St. Mark*. "But if the real object of the miracles was to meet some human need, then the recurrence of like conditions would lead to a recurrence of the miracle." . . . SAINTYVES, *Essais de Folklore Biblique*, p. 301: "il s'agit de deux récits parallèles, mais destinés à commenter deux cérémonies successives et s'inspirant de principes allégoriques quelque peu différents."

² K. L. SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 190 ff.: "Dass die beiden Speisungsgeschichten Dubletten sind, ist sicher. Nicht feststellbar ist aber, ob hier eine Spaltung der Überlieferung vorliegt, oder ob die eine Perikope aus der anderen entstanden ist. Dass Mk beide Erzählungen vorgefunden hat, dafür spricht der Rahmen, insbesondere der von der zweiten Perikope." CLEMEN, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments*, p. 217; BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 232: the feeding of the four thousand is: "eine Variante der vorigen Geschichte;" it is secondary. DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*; the second account is secondary and lacks the dynamic nature of the first. SCHNIEWIND, *Das NTD*, I, 1, re Mk 8 : 1-10 and Mt. 15 : 32-38; ALBERTZ, *Die Botschaft des NT*, I, 1, p. 139; HAUCK, *Markus*: "8, 1-10 ist dabei sicher Dublette zu 6, 32-53. Nur die verschiedenen Zahlangaben werden Mr zur Aufnahme des zweiten Berichtes veranlasst haben." The account of the fishing is probably a later "Ergänzung." KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 232, note 88, regarding interpretation as a doublet: "Die protestantischen Theologen scheinen geschlossen dieser Ansicht zu sein." STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 205. PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, II, p. 212: "Die Ideen-association der Apostel müsste die stockendste, ihr Gedächtnis völlig null gewesen sein . . ."

³ Mt. 15 : 34, 37; Mk. 8 : 5, 6, 8 . . . SCHNIEWIND, *op. cit.*, re Mk 8 : 1-9: "Die Zahlen 3 und 7 sind heilige Zahlen, wie im andern Bericht die 5 eine runde Zahl ist, die durchgängig gern gebraucht wird." RENGSTORF, *TWNT*, II, p. 626, does not perceive any "deeper" idea here. The seven here is: "runde Zahl ohne besonderen Nebensinn."

Jn. 6 : 1 speaks of: "over the sea of Galilee, which is the sea of Tiberias." In any case the feeding took place in the vicinity of the Sea of Galilee.¹ DALMAN is of the opinion that both feedings should be localized on the eastern shore, whereas others believe the western shore to have been the place.² The comment that there was "grass," Mt. 14 : 19 (Mk. 6 : 39 speaks of "green grass" and Jn. 6 : 10 of "much grass") tells us little about the season of the year. Jn. 6 : 4 does help us somewhat more; it speaks of Passover being nigh. DALMAN says that Matthew's account is reminiscent of the winter or the spring, and that John's version recalls March or April. A well-tended lawn should not be envisaged; grass grew wild and luxuriantly everywhere.³ The area was "desert." This has nothing to do with our modern word "desert," but means a place where few if any people live.⁴

(c) *Details in the accounts*

There are quite a number of details in the accounts which give rise to questions. As regards the feeding of the five thousand, the following may be mentioned. The Synoptists point to the late hour, about which John says nothing.⁵ In the Synoptic accounts the dis-

¹ K. L. SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 192 f. KOPP, *op. cit.*, p. 270: "Das Wo des Wunders ist nicht zu klären. Die biblischen Angaben sind zu dürftig."

² DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 184 ff.: "Kehren wir also zum Ostufer zurück, so schliesst zunächst der 'Berg' bei der Speisungsstätte der Fünftausend die Ebene von Bethsaida aus. Die Erwähnung des Gebietes der Zehn Städte vor der Speisung bei Markus (7, 31) empfiehlt den Hippos angehörenden Teil des Ostufers. In heidnischem Gebiet war für Jesus und seine Jünger am ehesten Zurückgezogenheit zu erwarten, dort war auch die Verlegenheit bei fehlendem Brote besonders gross." Cf. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, pp. 232, 269 ff. This should be compared with among others K. L. SCHMIDT, who has the western shore in mind; *op. cit.*, p. 188.

³ Mt. 14 : 19, ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τοῦ χόρτου; Mk. 6 : 39, ἀνακλιθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ χλωρῷ χορτῷ; Jn. 6 : 10, ἦν δὲ χόρτος πολὺς ἐν τῷ τοπῷ. DALMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 187 f. "Das Gras erhält in den drei Evangelien eine gesteigerte Betonung. Bei Matthäus ist es bloss natürliche Voraussetzung des Lagerens im Freien, bei Markus dient es der Anschaulichkeit, weshalb seine Farbe erwähnt wird, bei Johannes erscheint es in seiner Fülle wie eine von der Vorsehung besonders gefügte Ausstattung des Ortes" (p. 187, note 2) . . . K. L. SCHMIDT, *op. cit.*, p. 191, says that the period cannot be established with certainty; it can stay green until into July. DALMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 188, remarks that this limit does not apply to the vicinity of the Sea of Galilee.

⁴ Cf. KITTEL, TWNT, II, p. 654 ff. "Für Jesus ist die menschenleere Gegend ein Ort, an dem ihn nichts von Gott trennt, den er daher aufsucht, wenn er den Menschenmengen auszuweichen trachtet . . ." (p. 655).

⁵ Mt. 14 : 15; Mk. 6 : 35; Lk. 9 : 12. The designations differ. Matthew means

ciples draw Jesus' attention to the people's want;¹ according to John Jesus addressed Himself to Philip "to prove him," Jn. 6 : 6. The fact that the disciples suggested that the people be sent away proves that they were not far from the inhabited world. This likewise emerges from the disciples' question whether they can buy two hundred pennyworth of bread.² There were five loaves, according to John barley loaves, and two fishes available.³ Jesus commanded the people to sit down for their meal. Mt. 14 : 19 merely states that they were to "sit down on the grass," whilst Mk. 6 : 40 says that "they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties," and Lk. 9 : 14 speaks of their sitting down "by fifties in a company." Jn. 6 : 10 simply mentions that they "sat down."⁴ The Synoptists and John

that the hour for the meal has already elapsed. See ALLEN, St. Matthew; KLOSTERMANN, Das Matthäusevangelium.

¹ Mt. 14 : 15; Mk. 6 : 35, 36; Lk. 9 : 12.

² Mk. 6 : 37; Jn. 6 : 7. Note the difference in these texts; Philip remarks that two hundred pennyworth is not enough. Cf. with this Jn. 6 : 11; they could eat "as much as they would" . . . δηνάριον, denarius, דִּינָר, the current Roman

silver coin, several times mentioned in the New Testament; its value was one twenty-fifth of that of the golden denarius. See STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 290 ff.

³ Mt. 14 : 17; Mk. 6 : 38; Lk. 9 : 13. Jn. 6 : 8, 9: "One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto him, There is a lad here: which hath five barley loaves, and two small fishes: but what are they among so many?" Mt., Mk. and Lk. use for "fishes" the word ἰχθύς; Jn. uses here and in 21 : 9, 10 and 13 the word ὀψάριον, diminutive of ὄψον, i.e. "the cooked." BARRETT, St. John: "ὄψον", 'cooked food,' with the special meaning of pickled fish" . . . πέντε ἄρτους κριθίνους, five barley loaves, cf. 2 Ki. 4:42, εἴκοσι ἄρτους κριθίνους. παιδάριον means a young man, cf. Gen. 37 : 30; it may also mean slave. VON AMMON, Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu, II, p. 222, thinks of: "ein junger Ladendiener." Cf. OEPKE, TWNT, V, p. 637 . . . For kinds of bread and the cooking of fish, see STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 683 f.; II, p. 478. Barley bread was not especially liked. CALVIN, Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas, comments matter-of-factly re Jn. 6 : 11 that Christ "did not bring any great joy to the people" with the barley loaves and the dried fishes (non magnas populo lautitias paravit Christus).

⁴ Mk. 6 : 39, συμπόσια συμπόσια, חֲבֻרֹת חֲבֻרֹת, i.e. in the form of (table) companies. Mk. 6 : 40, πρασαί πρασαί, גִּזְרִיּוֹת גִּזְרִיּוֹת, i.e. in the form of (field)

groups. DALMAN, op. cit., p. 188: "Das Volk lagerte sich darauf wie zum gewöhnlichen Mahle, wobei um jede Schüssel eine Gruppe versammelt ist (Mark. 6, 39; Luk. 9, 14), oder wie Gartenbeete (Mark. 6, 40), nach einem im Orient verständlichen Bilde, wo das bewässerte Gartenland in eine Menge kleiner Vierecke . . . mit erhöhten Rändern zerfällt, in welche die zwischen ihnen laufenden Rinnen das Wasser führen." Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 13: "Die Liege- oder Sitzordnung mit gartentechnischen Ausdrücken zu bezeichnen, war auch sonst üblich." Strack-Billerbeck comments re Mk. 6 : 39: "Die Anwesenden sollten sich in Gruppen lagern so, dass diese lauter Tischgenossenschaften bildeten. Dergleichen Tischgenossenschaften, von denen jede eine Gruppe für sich aus-

all state that Jesus then took the food, looked up to heaven and pronounced the blessing. According to STRACK-BILLERBECK: "it was a fine custom of the Jewish people not to eat any food without thanking God for it before and after eating it. The text for this was found in Lev. 19 : 24." All prayers before the meal began with: "Praise unto thee, Yahweh our God, King of the World," whilst the continuation depended on the nature of the food. In the case of bread, it was: "Thou who maketh the bread come forth from the earth." ¹ Matthew and Mark say that Jesus broke the loaves. Matthew says nothing about the distribution of the fishes, whilst Mark and John mention both distributions. All the accounts stress that everyone was "filled," after which what was left over was collected: "twelve baskets full." ² Mark, Luke and John give five thousand as the number of persons filled, whilst Matthew does not include women and children in this figure. In the Synoptists the account comes to an abrupt end; John states the impression which the event made on the multitude. It was regarded as a "sign," and Jesus was said to be "of a truth that prophet that should come into the world," Jn. 6 : 14. This illustrates the independent treatment of the subject-matter by the fourth Evangelist.

The feeding of the four thousand, Mt. 15 : 29-39 and Mk. 8 : 1-10, also takes place in the vicinity of the Sea of Galilee. It may be deduced from Mk. 7 : 31 that the author has the eastern shore in mind: Jesus came from the region of Tyre and, via Sidon, entered the region of Decapolis. On the eastern shore there lived a mixed population

machte, waren den Juden von der Passahfeier her geläufig" (II, p. 13). BISHOP, *Jesus of Palestine*, p. 142: "No one knows how *πρασιαί* should be translated; but one of our Arab clergy interpreted the repeated words to imply something like furrows, the Arabic for which is *tilim* and the Hebrew *telem*. Here it would be the plural . . . *atlam*." Bishop refers to Job 31 : 38; 39 : 10; Ps. 65 : 10; Hos. 10 : 4; 12 : 12, which also speak of "furrows" in the fields.

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 685; cf. IV, 2, p. 611 ff. "Ein altjüdisches Gastmahl." BEYER, TWNT, II, p. 760.

² Mt. 14 : 20, *δωδεκα κοφίνους πλήρεις*; Mk. 6 : 43, which also mentions the surplus of fish. Lk. 9 : 17: "of fragments that remained to them twelve baskets." Jn. 6 : 13: "twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above unto them that had eaten" . . . There was a regulation that the scraps which had fallen on the ground during the meal had to be collected; STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 687; IV, 2, p. 625 ff. BISHOP, *op. cit.*, p. 142: "The 'broken pieces' were more likely pieces left over from our Lord's 'breaking' rather than bits lying on the ground. As an Oriental host He would provide more than necessary." TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 121, thinks it likely that the data on the filling and the numbers "are embellishments of the original story, although, it should be added, many commentators think otherwise."

of Jews and pagans, but the pagans were more numerous. "They glorified the God of Israel," Mt. 15 : 31, when they saw the healings performed by Jesus. Supporters of two feedings therefore believe that the first multitude fed by Jesus consisted of Jews (Galilee) and the second of pagans (Decapolis).¹ The initiative was taken by Jesus; He had compassion on the multitude, who had already been with Him for three days, Mt. 15 : 32, Mk. 8 : 2-3. It was impossible to obtain loaves in this area, and there were only seven loaves and a few little fishes available. After the meal there was a surplus of seven baskets full of fragments. Matthew again says that the women and children were not included in the figure of four thousand. Immediately after the feeding Jesus took ship for "the coasts of Magdala," Mt. 15 : 39, and according to Mark for "the parts of Dalmanutha," Mk. 8 : 10. There are a number of conjectures regarding the correct spelling and location of both these unknown places.²

(d) Old Testament and rabbinical accounts of feedings

Stories of miraculous feedings also occur elsewhere. Besides a number of accounts in the Old Testament, we also encounter them among the rabbis and in popular literature of many countries. The most important account in the Old Testament is that of the "bread from heaven," the manna which was given to the people of Israel as food in the wilderness, Exodus 16. In 1 Ki. 17 : 7-16 the story is preserved of the oil and the meal which the widow of Zarephath would not lack until God sent rain. 2 Ki. 4 : 1-7 contains the story of the oil that did not cease flowing until there was "not a vessel more," whilst in 2 Ki. 4 : 42-44 the story may be found of the feeding of the hundred men with twenty loaves of barley. FIEBIG draws attention to a rabbinical parallel. Despite the great difference between the content of this story and that in the New Testament, FIEBIG sees a similarity in the sudden "creation" of an abundance of bread.³

¹ RICHARDSON, op. cit., p. 95 ff. KEULERS, Mattheüs . . . This view had been held since Augustine.

² According to DALMAN, Orte u. Wege, p. 136, Magdala must be interpreted as Magadal, and Dalmanutha as Magdal Nuna. Cf. DALMAN, Die Worte Jesu, p. 52 f. ALLEN, St. Matthew: "Mk.'s Dalmanutha is certainly corrupt." KOPP, Die heiligen Stätten der Ev., p. 232, considers Dalmanutha: "wohl sicher identisch mit Magdala, schon weil die Parallele zur ersten Brotvermehrung 'das Land Genezareth' als Endpunkt der Fahrt verlangt." Cf. p. 246 ff.

³ FIEBIG, Jüd. Wundergeschichten, p. 22 ff. FIEBIG points to the idea frequently to be found in rabbinical literature that the merits of the pious have cosmic effects . . . We quote from the Epstein edition Ta'anith 24b/25a: "Rab Judah

(e) *Analogous stories among other peoples*

Outside Biblical and Jewish literature, too, we find many stories of food said to have been acquired or displayed in wonderful fashion. ORIGEN quotes a pronouncement by Celsus in which this great opponent of the Christian faith ranks the miracles of Jesus with the works of the magicians: "and with those which are performed by them that have learned them from the Egyptians, who in the midst of the market places, for a few obols, disclose the venerable teachings, expel demons from men, blow away diseases, summon the souls of heroes, and display choice meals and tables and pastries and deserts which do not exist. . . ." ¹ Gods and saints were credited with the power to produce or increase food. BULTMANN points to Indian stories and the food miracles in the Mohammedan Hadith. ² A

said in the name of Rab: Every day a Heavenly Voice is heard declaring, The whole world draws its sustenance because [of the merit] of Hanina my son, and Hanina my son suffices himself with a kab of carobs from one Sabbath eve to another. Every Friday his wife would light the oven and throw twigs ¹⁾ into it [25a] so as not to be put to shame. She had a bad neighbour who said, I know that these people have nothing, what then is the meaning of all this [smoke]? She went and knocked at the door. [The wife of R. Hanina] feeling humiliated [at this] retired into a room. A miracle happened and [her neighbour] saw the oven filled with loaves of bread and the kneading trough full of dough; she called out to her: You, you, bring your shovel, for your bread is getting charred; and she replied, I just went to fetch it. A Tanna taught: she actually had gone to fetch the shovel because she was accustomed to miracles."

¹⁾ Lit., 'Something that produces smoke' (transl. J. Rabinowitz). In Yoma 39a the following occurs: "[During the whole period] a blessing was bestowed upon the 'omer, the two breads ¹⁾), and the shewbread, so that every priest, who obtained a piece thereof as big as an olive, ate it and became satisfied with some eating thereof and even leaving something over. From that time on a curse was sent upon 'omer, two breads, and shewbread, so that every priest received a piece as small as a bean: the well-bred ²⁾) ones withdrew their hands from it, whilst voracious folk took and devoured it."

¹⁾ Lev. XXIII, 17 ff.

²⁾ Lit. 'modest,' 'decorous' (transl. L. Jung). Cf. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 687 f., who gives some examples of wonderful blessings.

¹ ORIGEN, c. Celsum, I, 68.

² BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 251. Bultmann refers to R. Garbe, Indien u. das Christentum, 1914 . . . AUFHAUSER, Buddha u. Jesus, p. 20 f., mentions two remarkable parallel texts. In the first account one of the guests at the heavenly feast asks himself how the food available, this "small charitable gift," must be divided among the many guests. "And see, the whole multitude ate of it and all ate their fill and nevertheless some was left, as if nobody had touched it." The second account tells of the wonderful increase of cakes during a meal for 500 monks. For the various views on the question whether or not there is a connection between Indian/Buddhist literature and the Gospels see the concise survey given by AUFHAUSER, op. cit., pp. 2-7.

Finnish legend tells of a girl who prepared food for a whole army from three barleycorns. A German fairy-tale has for its subject a marvellous bread which filled an army.¹ There is a wide selection of stories about goblets, bottles, baskets and tables that never empty. It is related that King Alexander had a goblet out of which his whole army could drink without the goblet having to be refilled.² A Celtic legend tells of the basket of Gwydnen Garanhir, in which nine men three times found the foods which they desired.³ Ethiopia has a Sun Table which, according to the natives, is always supplied with food by the wish of the gods.⁴ In Africa they tell of the wondrous speaking pot, which fills itself with the food desired.⁵ Many feeding miracles are attributed to saints: Francis of Assisi provided food for his fellow-passengers;⁶ André Corsini saw his bread increase in his bag;⁷ the basket full of fine cherries which the venerable Cottolengo, the "Intendant of Providence," distributed to a large crowd of poor persons in Turin in 1883, did not become empty,⁸ and the abbess of Kildare caused cow's milk to increase copiously. St. Nicholas fed 83 workmen who were building a new church on one loaf, and yet a large number of pieces were left, etc., etc.⁹ SAINTYVES, who collected a large number of stories and relates them with great verve, points to the literary dependence in the legends of the saints.¹⁰ He recalls the horn of plenty, the attribute of many old gods,¹¹ and sees in it, as in the bottles, tables, etc., which never

¹ See BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 251.

² SAINTYVES, *Essais de Folklore Biblique*, p. 255.

³ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

⁴ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 265. For HERODOTUS, *Hist.*, III, 18, it is not a wonder. All kinds of food were sacrificed to the gods which was consumed by passers-by and the poor.

⁵ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

⁶ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 239: "Les vivres étant venus à manquer sur le vaisseau qui transportait saint François d'Assises en Syrie, le saint bénit un petit morceau de pain qu'un ange lui avait apporté et il y en eut pour tous les passagers. Avec un pain qu'il bénit, saint Thomas ermite nourrit dix chasseurs et il y eut des restes."

⁷ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 240.

⁸ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 242 f. This is thus a question of a: "multiplication miraculeuse des fruits."

⁹ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 244. "Saint André, martyr en Ethiopie, multiplie le pain et l'eau, saint Colomban le pain et la cervoise, l'abbesse de Kildare fait augmenter le lait des vaches."

¹⁰ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 252: "L'imitation littéraire est la principale source de tous ces récits miraculeux et cette multiplication prodigieuse, elle aussi, est principalement l'œuvre de pieux rhéteurs."

¹¹ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 257 ff. See Ovid, *Fastes*, V, 111-128. "Qu'il s'agisse

become empty, the idea of fertility and initiation rites.¹ According to SAINTYVES we must therefore regard the loaves in the Gospels as "seasonal loaves;" the Biblical stories must be interpreted in the light of the pagan ones.²

With such a wide variety of stories, it may be asked whether the New Testament accounts perhaps form part of this "pattern." Did nothing happen? Or did something happen, and if so, what?

(f) *Different explanations*

Attempts have been made in many ways to find a natural explanation for the "feeding miracle." PAULUS argues that no miracle is described here. "They do not tell of the fact as a miracle. They tell of it without referring to astonishment on the part of the people or of themselves." If the bread had in fact been increased, this astonishment would have been bound to occur. And in that case, would not a piece of miraculous bread have been preserved as a relic? "Would not everyone have done his best to take so rare a relic home with him and to keep it for his neighbours and friends, for his children and his children's children?" No, says PAULUS, what happened is this: Jesus set an example; then the others also shared out some of their bread.³ VON AMMON continues in the footsteps of Paulus. He describes metaphysical speculation on the miracle of a new creation within creation as a lack of respect for the intellect! How much time would have been required to get the people to sit down in groups, whilst evening was already drawing on! "Even a brigade of trained infantry would have difficulty in forming up and sitting down in twenty ranks on the grass for the meal in so short a time as the Galileans under the direction of the apostles." Mt. 14 : 19 is "embellishment." And how long would the distribution then have lasted? The only solution is that Jesus first distributed bread from His own supply: "so as in this way to encourage the other families

d'une corne rituelle avec laquelle on faisait des libations ou des offrandes aux fleuves ou aux sources, on ne peut guère en douter. Ovide et Hygin le disent clairement," cf. Ovid, *Metamorph.*, IX, 77-92. "Le miracle de la corne fut inventé pour légitimer un rite, c'est l'exégèse rituelle dont on accompagnait l'usage de la corne dans les cérémonies annuelles à fin d'abondance et de prospérité" (p. 264 f.).

¹ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 267.

² SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 303: "Les pains d'orge d'Elisée sont des pains de prémices et l'on est en droit de penser que les pains d'orge dont parle l'Évangile étaient des pains de la saison destinés à être offerts et consommés durant la Pâque."

³ PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, II, p. 205 ff.

who had something to share to extend similar hospitality, and so to inspire in them a public spirit of beneficence and brotherly love, which had to make them accessible to the higher ideals of the Kingdom of Heaven." In this way the miracle remained a benefaction, see Ac. 10 : 38, "without the story losing any of its rights."¹ Others have endeavoured to extend and embellish the naturalistic explanation somewhat. Bahrdt is much in the favour of the interpretation that Jesus was standing at the secret entrance to a cave, from which intimates kept on handing Him bread which had been stacked in the cave beforehand, whilst the apostles distributed the food among the multitude.²

Pierre Nahor (Emilie Lerou) introduces devout, rich ladies who had provided loaves and fried fish, so that the multitude would not suffer any hunger.³ Paulus' rationalistic explanation is rejected by STRAUSS. If the Old Testament stories are studied, it will be clear that we are concerned here with mythical derivation. "If these Mosaic stories are compared with our Evangelical ones, a striking resemblance is also perceptible in the separate features," says STRAUSS.⁴ There is thus no question of history, but of imitation, in order that Jesus, as the Messiah, could also be said to have performed such feats. Although SCHWEITZER rejects the would-be naturalistic explanations, he cannot accept the story of the feeding as a miracle. "All of this is historical, but not the final remark that they were all filled. Jesus caused the food which he and his disciples had with them to be distributed among the people, so that everyone received a piece, after he had first said a word of thanks over it." Jesus is the coming Messiah, and therefore, without their knowing it, this meal becomes "the antitype of the Messianic feast." "The feeding was more than a love feast, a communal meal. It was, from Jesus' point of view, a sacrament of salvation."⁵ The originally secret eschatological sacrament has been transformed by tradition into a miracle, assisted by the eschatological tension in which people lived.⁶

¹ VON AMMON, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 218-230. GOODSPEED, *A Life of Jesus*, p. 105: "Generously distributed, there was plenty for them all . . . The feeding of the five thousand was a sermon in action."

² See SCHWEITZER, *Die Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 41.

³ See SCHWEITZER, *op. cit.*, p. 359 . . . P. NAHOR, *Jesus*. German translation by W. Bloch, 1905.

⁴ STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 205 ff.

⁵ SCHWEITZER, *op. cit.*, p. 421 f. . . . HAUCK, Markus, calls Schweitzer's explanation "aktiv-eschatologisch."

⁶ SCHWEITZER, *op. cit.*, p. 424. One should also think of Jesus' walking on

Another form of explanation is that of allegory and symbolism, with or without a certain historical substratum being presumed. Profound and edifying reflections have been given on "spiritual bread," etc., but these evade the difficulties.¹

Others ascribe the "filling" of the multitude to the hypnotic, suggestive power of Jesus. According to SCHÄFER, this is an example of mass suggestion.² Spiritualists assume that this is a case of apport.³

EISLER finds a political element in the feeding. He says that it must be understood what Jesus wanted. The words from Mt. 6 : 25-34 and Lk. 12 : 22-32, in which Jesus says that they need not worry about food, drink and clothing, only become clear in connection with Jesus' appeal to follow Him into the wilderness. Think of divine providence in the days of Moses. "The heavenly bread of the doctrine is the true manna of the wilderness, the living streams of knowledge of God from the accompanying Rock of faith are the true spring of Moses." Jesus therefore wanted to lead back to life in the wilderness those "who left everything" for His sake. "The symbolic repetition of the two wilderness miracles of Moses" which the Gospels ascribed to Jesus is therefore of great importance

the water the same evening. "Der Ansatz zum Wunderhaften in diesen Berichten war mit dem Unbegreiflichen, das die Menschen der Umgebung Jesu damals erlebten und erwarteten, gegeben."

¹ A few examples. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Strom.*, VI, XI, 94, advances the suggestion that Jesus fed the people: "alluding to the preparatory education of Greeks and Jews for the divine wheat, the food grown by law. For barley is ready for harvesting before wheat. And the fishes signified Greek philosophy, which is produced and is prevalent in the tidal wave of the pagans, given as they were to abundant support of those who still lay on the ground" . . . V, VI, 33: the fact that there were five loaves is "most significant;" the number corresponds to the five senses. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, points to Loisy's explanation. Loisy says that there is no historical nucleus, but an old motif was transferred to Jesus. The account is meant to illustrate that the community lives on the inexhaustible Word of God.

² SCHÄFER, *Jesus in psychiatrischer Beleuchtung*, p. 65. By way of illustration Schäfer gives the following "proof," among others. "Zehn und mehr Personen bissen in Seife und glaubten schöne Äpfel zu kosten, tranken Wasser für Wein, assen Kohle für Torte u. dgl. mehr, und glaubten umgekehrt, mit einem Stück schöner Torte grüne Seife erhalten zu haben" . . . OTTO, *Reich Gottes*, recalls the "force" of the "Charismatiker." The latter was able: "durch geringe Spende, die er gesegnet hat, den Hunger der Empfangenden zu stillen. Die Weise der Wirkung ist der der Heilung analog" (p. 281).

³ HAUCK, *Markus*, draws attention to this spiritualistic view . . . A different explanation is that given by E. Nestle, see KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium* "Nach E. Nestle (*Zeitschr. f. d. neutest. Wiss.* 7, 185) wäre die Speisungsgeschichte aus der Etymologie Bethsaida = Haus des Proviantes, *Onomastica sacra* ed. Lagarde 174, 7 herausgesponnen."

in understanding Jesus' intention: the sign of the great deliverance is displayed therein.¹

It is without doubt a fascinating business to investigate how human ingenuity reaches new heights in its efforts to eliminate the supernatural from the story of the feeding.

If it is accepted that "something must have happened,"² various views are still possible. One can envisage the food having been created in the hands of Jesus, as many have done.³ Another theory, that held

¹ EISLER, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 236-254. The feeding is a "messianische Gleichnis-handlung." "Jesus hat somit als erster getan, was die charasim—die Josephus boshast goëtes nennt—zur Zeit des Prokurators Felix ihm nachgemacht haben. Er hat eine Volksmenge in die Wüste hinausgeführt und ihr dort das Manna-wunder und die Vorzeichen der kommenden Befreiung gewiesen und gedeutet" (p. 249 f.) . . . "Demnach scheint es mir also keine unberechtigte Unterstellung zu sein, dass Jesus die, die 'alles im Stich lassen' wollten, um ihm 'nachzufolgen,' zum rekhabbitischen Leben in der Wüste zurückführen wollte. Wenn seine Königsboten mit dem Ruf šubhu! 'kehrt zurück!' durch die Städte und Dörfer Israels zogen, so müssen sie die Rückkehr zum freien Wüstenleben der Vorzeit gemeint haben" (p. 252). But who would want to follow a "liberator" who did not want force to be used and demanded a "better justice"? "Der Ruf, den Jesus ins Volk hinauszusenden versucht hatte, war fast unerhört verhallt" (p. 254). Cf. the chapter: Jewish Opinions on Jesus' Miracles.

² F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 137: "Das ist keine erfundene Geschichte, trotz allem Scharfsinn mythischer und symbolischer Erklärung, welchen man auf sie verwendet hat; es muss etwas geschehen sein, was die Menge aufs höchste erregte und ihre irdische Messiashoffnungen jäh aufflammen liess."

³ This view is a very old one. AUGUSTINE, In *Johannis Ev.*, Tract. XXIV, 1: "For who supports the whole world even today than He, who creates the corn from a handful of grains? He therefore did it as God. For, just as He multiplies the corn from a handful of grains, so He multiplied five loaves in His hands. For the power lay in the hands of Christ. The five loaves were thus as it were seeds for Him, not, indeed, entrusted to the earth, but multiplied by Him who made the earth (*Quis enim et nunc pascit universum mundum, nisi ille qui de paucis granis segetes creat? Fecit ergo quomodo Deus. Unde enim multiplicat de paucis granis segetes, inde in manibus suis multiplicavit quinque panes. Potestas enim erat in manibus Christi: panes autem illi quinque, quasi semina erant, non quidem terrae mandata, sed ab eo qui terram fecit multiplicata*). LACTANTIUS, *Div. Instit.*, IV, 15. Jesus Himself broke the bread into pieces (*minutatim*), and likewise the fishes (*comminuebat*) "and both were multiplied in his hands" (*et utraque in manibus eius augebantur*). FILLION, *Les Miracles de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ*, II, p. 23. KEULERS, *Mattheüs*. GOULD, *St. Mark*, says that this is "a purely creative act, a creation out of nothing . . . All talk about acceleration of natural processes is mere talk, because there is here nothing to start from in such a process." VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*, believes that one can speak here of a "creative miracle." Cf. GREYDANUS, *Lukas*, I; PLUMMER, *St. Luke*. HELD, *Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch.* (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 172): the miracle is effected through Jesus; it is doubtless: "eine Epiphanie Jesu vor seinen Jüngern—aber sie vollzieht sich durch eine Handlung, an der die Jünger selbst beteiligt sind." According to HELD the "Neuerzählung" by Matthew is concerned with bringing

by CALVIN, for instance, is that the loaves grew in the hands of the disciples.¹ Or was perhaps the food value increased?² It is precisely this view of creation, of a quantitative increase in the loaves and fishes, which forms the main target of the rationalists.

VON AMMON points to the abnormal process: the corn has been ground and baked and the fishes have been dried or cooked, so how can any germinating capacity still be left?³ And therefore an accelerated natural process is just as impossible as a deed of creation. STRAUSS wonders how this creative act by Jesus must then be pictured, and compares the loaves with wetted sponges, which swell!⁴ WOOLSTON considers the whole story impossible and says that it is "a little against Sense and Reason."⁵

(g) By means of the following remarks we believe that we can decide on our *conclusions*.

1. The link between the Old Testament accounts and those of the New Testament must not be interpreted in the sense of a mythical

to the fore the part played by the disciples, by means of abridgments and amendments.

¹ CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mt. 14 : 16. The loaves were given to the disciples: "in order that these admirable provisions would increase under their hands, and that they would accordingly be the servants of Christ's divine force" (... panes illis fuisse datos, ut inter eorum manus cresceret admirabilis illa copia, atque ita divinae Christi virtutis ministri forent). Cf. re Jn. 6 : 11 ... THOMAS, *Summa Theologiae*, III, qu. XLIV, art. IV, does not envisage a method of creation, but addition of a strange substance, which was converted into bread. "Ad quantum dicendum, quod multiplicatio panum non est facta per modum creationis, sed per additionem extraneae materiae in panes conversae. Unde Aug. super Joan. dicit, Unde multiplicat de paucis granis segetes, inde in manibus suis multiplicavit quinque panes. Manifestatum est autem quod per conversionem grana multiplicantur in segetes." LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle*, p. 499: "Quant à la multiplication du pain, il est juste d'observer que cet événement n'eut pas lieu par création, mais par l'adjonction d'une matière étrangère que Jésus-Christ convertit ensuite en pain." TRENCH, *Notes on the Miracles*, p. 269 f., sees the increase as "an act of divine omnipotence," but not as an "absolute creation out of nothing." Instead he regards it as "an act of creative accretion; the bread growing under his hands."

² F. BARTH, *op. cit.*, p. 137: Jesus multiplies: "sei es das Quantum oder die Nährkraft desselben, indem er die Brote persönlich bricht und austeilte."

³ VON AMMON, *op. cit.*, II, p. 227.

⁴ STRAUSS, *op. cit.*, II, p. 209: "Brote, die in den Händen des Austheilenden wie angefeuchtete Schwämme aufquellen, Bratfische, welchen, wie dem lebendigen Krebs die abgerissenen Scheeren allmählig, so die abgebrochenen Theile plötzlich wieder wachsen, gehören offenbar nicht in das Reich der Wirklichkeit, sondern in ein ganz anderes."

⁵ WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, I, p. (52): the following into the wilderness "without eating, is a little against Sense and Reason."

derivation, as STRAUSS sees it. True, the possibility of literary influence proves to be present: the type existed.¹ But, beyond that, too great an emphasis should not be laid on the Old Testament and rabbinical parallels and on those in the history of religions.² The accounts from the New Testament are of an independent and separate nature. It is not the pattern but the situation which shows the path to be followed by exegesis.

2. Internal difficulties and indications. We have already remarked that *one* feeding will have to be envisaged. Mk. 6 : 52 and Mt. 16 : 9-10 and parallel passage cannot, however, simply be expunged. But the absence of any comment by the disciples on the tremendous event gives rise to the question whether the multitude did not perhaps have some provisions with them. It can hardly be imagined that in so large a crowd nobody had any food with him! On the other hand, Jesus' instructions: "Give ye them to eat," together with the question: "How many loaves have ye? go and see," signify unambiguously that the food had to be provided by the disciples. There is a further difficulty in the numbers. Is there meant to be some link between the five loaves and the five thousand? Is the number of the twelve baskets an allusion to the twelve disciples? Or had these twelve baskets to serve as "evidence?"³ What was the size of the multitude? Matthew says about five thousand, not counting women and children.⁴ Did this make the total considerably higher? Is this therefore merely a rough estimate, or must we assume that these numbers were added

¹ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 99. These accounts: "haben zweifellos ihre Gestaltung nach dem Vorbild der Brotvermehrung durch Elisa bekommen." Cf. p. 77 ff.

² See RENGSTORF, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Das NTD, I, 2), p. 104 . . . Jewish circles stress the dependence of the Old Testament. KRAUSS, *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, VII, p. 168, art. "Jesus of Nazareth," says that miracles such as the feeding and the resurrection of the dead "have probably been suggested by the miracles of Moses and the raising of the dead—by those of Elijah." KLAUSNER, *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, IX, col. 56, art. "Jesus von Nazareth," says: "Die meisten der ihm in den Evangelien zugeschriebenen Wunder sind zweifellos nur als Erfüllung biblischer Verheissungen und Nachahmung der grossen Prophetenwunder gedacht."

³ Cf. SCHLINGENSIEPEN, *Die Wunder des N.T.*, p. 35, note 2: "Nach Makarius Magnes sollten die zwölf schweren von den Jüngern getragenen Körbe, Mt. 14, 20, dazu dienen, das Speisungswunder in der Wüste über nachträgliche Zweifel zu erheben. Vgl. auch Theodor von Mopsuestia zu Joh. 6, 12" . . . In the CHRISTIAN SIBYLL., VIII, 277 f., it is said that Jesus filled the twelve baskets: "to the hope of the peoples."

⁴ Mt. 14 : 21; cf. Gen. 46 : 26: "besides Jacob's sons' wives"; Ezra 2 : 65.

later, or are exaggerated? ¹ The statement that those present sat down "in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties," Mk. 6 : 40, does, however, indicate a certain accuracy; the total could have been quickly estimated in this way. We have already pointed to the difficulty which many mention, viz. that the Synoptists say nothing about the astonishment of the disciples. Must we therefore not deduce from this after all that we are concerned with an ordinary, though ceremonial, meal, the account of which has been transformed by tradition into a wonder?

The number of irregularities and objections is indeed not inconsiderable. And yet, however the text is twisted or turned, the only possible conclusion is that the four Evangelists endeavoured to tell not of an ordinary, but of an extraordinary feeding. The fact that John tried to give a tinge of his own to his account is immaterial to the data. This does not mean that we are concerned with a faultless historical report. Proclamation and historiography are interwoven, and it is impossible to say how tradition may have influenced the existing version, or whether a non-historical trait may have crept in. ² But the four authors are unanimous in their testimony that it was Jesus' intention to feed the multitude, as Jn. 6 : 5 says in express terms. Against the hypothesis that the multitude shared their provisions may be adduced Mk. 6 : 44, which speaks of "the loaves," which can have been none other than those of the disciples. As

¹ See SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 175. L. Noack, *Die Geschichte Jesu*, 1876, believes that the numbers were added later and that Jesus fed those present with loaves and fishes which he had bought from a "Markentenderknabe" . . . Considerable quantities also occur in the miracles of Epidauros; see HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*, p. 19, miracle 25. Sostrata of Pherai was pregnant with worms; she was carried into the temple on a bier. Aesculapius cut her belly open: "und holte eine gewaltige Menge kleiner Tiere heraus, zwei Waschbecken voll." In miracle 30 (p. 21) it is stated that Gorgias of Heracleia had been wounded by an arrow in the lungs: "und anderthalb Jahr so heftig vereitert, dass er siebenundsechsig Schüsseln mit Eiter füllte." HERZOG comments: "Typisch für die Wunderzählungen sind die genauen aber übertriebenen Quantitätsangaben" (p. 82). TROELS LUND, *Gesundheit u. Krankheit*, p. 223, points to the fantastically high figures which were stated in the sixteenth century with regard to plagues. "Sie stehen nur als ein Ausdruck dafür da, wie stark die Einbildungskraft aufgeschreckt war. So ist es wohl kaum wahrscheinlich, dass in Stockholm, 1548-49, 7000 Menschen und wiederum 1565 18000 Menschen gestorben sein sollen." The whole city had a population hardly greater than 20 to 30,000 . . . And remember the high figures stated in the Old Testament.

² Cf. MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 364: "In the growing tradition this kindly action was evidently made the subject of later implications, which reach their full development in the Fourth Gospel, but do not appear to have been contained in the original version of the story."

soon as one begins to speculate about an "accelerated natural process," about the loaves "growing," etc., the only result achieved is that the event becomes rather suspect in our world of ideas. If one carefully reads the cardinal text: "And when he had taken the five loaves and the two fishes, he looked up to heaven, and blessed, and brake the loaves, and gave them to his disciples to set before them; and the two fishes divided he among them all,"¹ it can hardly be denied that a particular event, a deliberate act in the blessing and breaking of the bread, is designated here.² In this act the Kingdom of God functions. When the Kingdom of God functions, questions about the "how" of the effect on inanimate or animate nature recede into the background, for then every form of creation enters the service of the Kingdom. PLUMMER has pointed out that the way in which the miracle happened cannot be investigated and then rightly adds: "it is a literal fulfilment of Mt. VI, 33."³

The multitude, seeking the Kingdom of God, here have the benefaction of "and all these things shall be added unto you" bestowed upon them. In the "filling" of the multitude we are also reminded of the promises of the Old Testament.⁴ If we see the miraculous feeding as a function of the Kingdom of God, we cut short SCHWEITZER's view that we are concerned with a "secret eschatological sacrament." "The evening meal at Jerusalem had the same sacramental significance as that by the Sea," is SCHWEITZER's opinion.⁵ However, the accounts contain no allusion in this direction.

¹ Mk. 6 : 41. Mt. 14 : 18, 19; Lk. 9 : 16; Jn. 6 : 11.

² PLUMMER, St. Luke: "We are probably to understand that this blessing is the *means* of the miracle."

³ PLUMMER, St. Luke. TRENCH, op. cit., p. 266, says the same thing. BARTH, K.D., II, 2, p. 495: "Er speist die 5000 mit dem Wenigen, was die Apostel selbst ihnen zu bieten haben, und ihnen bleibt in Wahrheit nur übrig, das Viele, das er gibt, in der Gestalt des Wenigen, das sie zu geben haben, auszutragen und anzubieten." GROSHEIDE, Johannes. "We may add the comment that the actual fact of the miracle is not recounted. Where did the bread increase? In the hands of Jesus? In the hands of the apostles as they distributed it? None of this is of importance to us. For that matter, the actual miracle cannot be described; that is characteristic of a miracle." See also CLAVIER, La multiplication des pains dans le Ministère de Jésus, p. 445.

⁴ Cf. Ps. 37 : 19; Ps. 145 : 15, 16. HAUCK, TWNT, VI, p. 59, points to the eschatological element in the word περισσεύειν = to be present in plenty, to be left over. "Die Speisung des Volkes ist Gegenbild zur Wüstenspeisung. Jesus ist der zweite Mose. Aber die messianische Speisung überbietet durch ihre Fülle die mosaische, die für jeden nur das Zureichende brachte (Ex. 16, 18). Die Menge der übrigen Brocken, die in allen Berichten hervorgehoben wird, zeugt von der Fülle des Mahles (Mt 14, 20; 15, 37; Lk 9, 17; J 6, 12 f.)."

⁵ SCHWEITZER, op. cit., p. 424 f.

BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL rightly characterizes the meal as a "Messianic feast," but as regards his explanation that everyone has his "small piece of the Lord's bread and his part of the fish," so that they are all filled, we wonder whether BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, with the "small piece," is not anticipating Holy Communion in his theological thought! But he strikingly says: "In the midst of the wilderness, among the sheep without a shepherd, there stands one who breaks the bread; the Messianic feast transcends realism and its confusions, God's Kingdom opens, they eat and are filled, without knowing how."¹

Establishing a connection between the miraculous feeding and the sacrament of Holy Communion doubtless has great significance from the theological point of view, provided that it is borne clearly in mind that the connection is not present in an immediate, historical sense. The text merely says that the physical hunger of the people was the issue. This is also so in John, Jn. 6 : 5, although here the feeding at once becomes a "sign:" Jesus is the "bread of life," 6 : 22-59.²

¹ BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, Markus . . . HUNTER, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, p. 58. " . . . it may be that the feeding was simply a sacramental meal and that the whole story is historical except the statement that 'all were filled'." MENOUD, *La Signification du Miracle dans le Nouveau Testament*, p. 180 f., says that the multiplication of the bread and the surplus show that man's need for food: "est encore la marque de sa faiblesse et de l'imperfection de l'économie présente." This miracle prophesies "une libération définitive," of which Rev. 7 : 16, 17 speaks.

² See DODD, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, p. 335 ff., on the significance of the "bread of life." Dodd says: "In rabbinic tradition bread is a standing symbol of the Torah. This tradition can be traced back to the time of Eliezer ben Hyrcanus and Joshua ben Chananiah, not far from the date of this Gospel" (p. 336). Also of importance is what we find in BARTH, K.D., II, 2, p. 495. The disciples are helpless against the great multitude. By what Jesus does, He gives His disciples "a rest." He gives instructions that the people must sit down in groups: "und was er dann tut, ist bekanntlich bis auf die Formel eine Vorwegnahme der Einsetzung des Abendmahls . . ." Cf. K.D., IV, p. 241 f. Barth points out that Jesus' acts were also of a symbolic nature. The miracles are: "keine zufällige, sondern sinnvolle Geschichtstatsachen." They have dimensions transcending the fact as such. When the community read or heard of the miracles, these became so to speak transparent. "Hörte sie von den Speisungen in der Wüste, so konnte es doch nur schon wegen des Wortlauts der Beschreibung des Handelns Jesu nicht anders sein, als dass sie—gewiss nicht nur, aber auch an das sie konstituierende Abendmahl und darüber hinaus an das Freudenmahl zu denken hatte, zu dem sie selbst die Tausende und Tausende von Hungrigen in der Welt einzuladen hatte, ja denen sie jetzt schon zu essen geben sollte." Barth in no way wishes to reduce the explanation of the miracles to this sphere of thought, but says: "Es ist aber kein pudendum, sondern eine besondere Stärke dieser Texte,

As in the healings, it is obvious in the feeding that the saving love of Jesus Christ relates to man in his totality. It is therefore not clear why SCHLEIERMACHER cannot discover a moral motive here.¹

To sum up, we may say that Jesus did not perform a "Schauwunder," that He did not want to work His way up to social reformer, king or champion of political liberty, see Jn. 6 : 15. In the meal the presence of the Messiah-King, whose Kingdom functions in the provision of food, is manifest; how this food was provided was a mystery to those then present, and it is still a mystery, since it was divine providence.

The miraculous feeding finds its type in the past in the feeding of Israel in the wilderness; in the Christian Church we receive its "sign" in the sacrament of Holy Communion, whilst for the future it indicates the glory of the reign of salvation.² Separate, independent

dass sie unleugbar *auch diese* Dimension haben: dass sie, indem Jesus in den von ihnen berichteten Handlungen *Geschichte* macht, faktisch zugleich deren *Gleichnisse* sind. Die Kirchenväter haben das noch gewusst und waren darum in diesem Stück grundsätzlich bessere Exegeten als die, die in panischer Angst vor dem, was man dann als 'Allegorese' in Bausch und Bogen verurteilen zu können meinte, überhaupt nicht mehr in diese Richtung blicken wollten." We agree with Barth that the miracles have a wider and deeper dimension than the single happening, and that one may not disregard the presence of sign in miracles. But as regards the 'Allegorese,' we believe that the greatest caution must be observed. However, it should always be borne in mind that a "jump" is required to pass from the limited terra firma of the described event to the endless realm of reflection! Not everyone can make the theological mental leap of another. For other proponents of the sacramental theory see CULLMANN, *Urchristentum* u. Gottesdienst, p. 61 ff. See also TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 121 f.; GILS, *Jésus Prophète*. "La tradition primitive a vu dans le miracle de la multiplication des pains une préfiguration de la Cène . . . Dès la première multiplication des pains, Jésus annonce en somme l'Eucharistie et la mission universelle" (p. 120 f., cf. pp. 38 and 162). CLAVIER, *La multiplication des pains dans le Ministère de Jésus*. Cf. on the other hand BARRETT, *St. John*. "It does not seem probable that John here intends to introduce into his narrative an equivalent to an item of eucharistic ritual." But cf. Introduction, p. 69 ff. According to BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 156, there is no connection between the feeding miracle and the eucharist. Jn. 6 : 51b-58 is "redakt. Zusatz."

¹ SCHLEIERMACHER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 222 . . . ORIGEN, *c. Celsus*, I, 30; I, 68; II, 51, already drew attention to the ethical criteria in connection with Jesus' miraculous power.

² Cf. GOPPELT, *Typos*, p. 83: "Tatsächlich geht es in unserer Geschichte zuerst um das Gegenwärtige, um Hunger und Speisung. Aber vielleicht wollte Jesus selbst darüber hinaus durch diese Herrlichkeitsoffenbarung, die er mehr als irgendein anderes seiner Wunder selbst herbeigeführt hat, ein Zeichen aufrichten. Unter dem Bilde des Mahles hat er oft die Heilszeit dargestellt. Erinnert nicht auch das stark betonte "ἐρημος" an Israels Heilszeit?" . . . KITTEL, *TWNT*, II, p. 654 ff. STAUFFER, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, p. 143, says the following with regard to John's view of Communion: "Das Mannawunder in

and concrete in their historical manifestations, each displaying and designating the character of the miracle in its own way, the feedings "meet" one another in their eschatological aspects.

der Wüste weist typologisch über sich hinaus auf Jesu Inkarnation und Brotwunder. Das Wunderbrot Jesu wiederum weist über sich hinaus auf das Lebensbrot der Eucharistie. Das eucharistische Brot endlich weist über sich hinaus auf das eschatologische Messiasmahl." ALBERTZ, *op. cit.*, I, 1, p. 139: "Gewiss erweist sich Jesus hier als der Herr über die Kräfte der Natur, aber das eigentliche Anliegen der Erzählung ist die für die Teilnehmer ungewusste Vorwegnahme des messianischen Mahls."

XV. THE STILLING OF THE STORM

Introduction

The nature miracles of Jesus include the stilling of the storm on the Sea of Galilee, which is described by the Synoptists, the one in more detail than the other.¹ The accounts display a number of lesser and greater differences. Mark, for instance, does not say that Jesus went into the boat, though he does say that "the even was come" and that "there were also with him other little ships."

The storms on the Sea of Galilee are well known. Storm and calm succeed one another rapidly. DALMAN tells how he saw boats on the Sea of Galilee battling against the wind and waves. The wind is nearly always stronger in the afternoon than in the morning or the evening, but when a storm gets up in the evening, it is all the more dangerous.² Whilst the storm raged, Jesus lay sleeping. This is the only reference made to Jesus' sleeping. Mark adds that he was "in the hinder part of the ship, asleep on a pillow." It was the custom to take a pillow along for those who were not concerned in working the boat or fishing or who were resting from their work. It was kept under the coxswain's seat.³

The disciples were frightened, though their numbers included experienced fishermen. They woke Jesus and begged Him for help. The cries with which they woke Him are rendered differently. Matthew and Luke give a direct appeal for help: "Lord, save us, we perish" (Mt. 8 : 25); "Master, master, we perish" (Lk. 8 : 24), whilst the cry in Mark contains a note of reproach: "Master, carest thou not that we perish?" (Mk. 4 : 38). Matthew has the cry of the disciples followed immediately by Jesus' rebuke: "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?" In Mark and Luke the rebuke follows the stilling of the storm.⁴

¹ Mt. 8 : 23-27; Mk. 4 : 35-41; Lk. 8 : 22-25. According to DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 68, we are concerned with a "Novelle." BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 230, classifies it among the "Wundergeschichten." SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 135, draws attention to the accurate indication of time and place; see Mk. 4 : 35.

² DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 197 f. . . For details of the Sea of Galilee see p. 128 ff. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 212 ff.; p. 258 f. for the gales.

³ DALMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 198 . . . BISHOP, *Jesus of Palestine*, p. 132 f.: "Many Palestinians have the knack of going to sleep at any time, which helps to maintain liveliness and equability. With Him it was confidence."

⁴ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 95, infers from this order

Whilst Matthew and Luke state that Jesus "rebuked" both the wind and the sea, Mark first mentions the rebuking of the wind and then Jesus' command to the sea: "Peace, be still." The subsiding of the storm filled the disciples with fear and caused them to cry out: "What manner of man is this that even the wind and the sea obey him?" Matthew says that "men marvelled," thus signifying that the news had spread to a wider circle.¹

This surprising account of Jesus' dominion over the elements has given rise to many questions, explanations and comparisons, which we should like to consider further:

- (a) Various explanations;
- (b) Accounts of the subduing of water and wind;
- (c) Comparison with Old Testament data;
- (d) Jesus as master of the forces of nature.

(a) *Various explanations*

Of course one can dismiss this miracle with an irritated exclamation, as does VON HARNACK with his: "we no longer believe that a storm was stilled by a man, and we shall never believe it again," but this does not help one to find an explanation for it.²

The rationalists believed that the story could be straightened out in relatively easy fashion. PAULUS is of the opinion that Jesus, who always had His "great Messianic purpose" clearly in mind, did not give Himself up for lost so easily. The words uttered by Julius Caesar during a storm: "You carry Caesar and Caesar's lot travels with you," applied also to Jesus: it is the noble sense of "audaces

that the form of Mark and Luke is older than that of Matthew; the character of the dialogue is brought out better by Mark and Luke. Mark has the oldest form . . . BORNKAMM, TWNT, VII, p. 197 f., points to the various versions in Mk. 4 : 37, λαῖλαψ μεγάλη ἀνέμου, Lk. 8 : 23, λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου and Mt. 8 : 24, σεισμὸς μέγας ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ. Bornkamm is of the opinion that Matthew uses the word σεισμὸς: "in bewusster Erinnerung an die apokalyptische Bedeutung" of the word, in order to give the account as a whole: "eine beispielhafte und sinnbildliche Auslegung."

¹ Cf. ALLEN, St. Matthew; KEULERS, Mattheüs. "The same feeling that the disciples had was shared by those who were in the other boats (Mk. 4 : 36) or who heard of the miracle later."

² VON HARNACK, *Het Wezen des Christendoms*, p. 21. KUHaupt, *Die okkulten Erscheinungen u. das Wunderbare um die Person Jesu*, p. 51, reproaches Harnack with being inconsistent, since he does believe in the healings to some extent. "Er erkennt den Komparativ an und leugnet den Superlativ."

fortuna juvat!" Jesus certainly did not speak to the sea, but He doubtless cried out, as one usually does in such circumstances: what a dreadful storm! It must be over soon! "Some of those present seem to have interpreted such words of Jesus in accordance with their result, as causes of the result itself, so the speak as incantations." ¹ We are therefore simply concerned with a misunderstanding by the disciples. VON AMMON says that the danger probably was not great, as is evidenced by the fact "that not one of the other small boats which left the shore with them sank or was even damaged." After the sea had already raged over the boat and the gale had passed, Jesus adjured the elements, just as fever and demons were addressed in those days. ²

Such rationalistic points of view are held by many, and a scholar such as KLAUSNER regards this event as an ordinary storm which suddenly sprang up, and whose subsiding was elevated to a wonder by the Galilean fishermen, who craved miracles. He concludes his discussion of it with a resigned: "such has ever been the way with simple-minded people." ³ STRAUSS is quite certain that we are concerned here with a myth. In the Old Testament Yahweh was portrayed as Lord of the waters, see for instance Psalms 106 : 9; Nahum 1 : 4; Exodus 14 : 16, 21; well then, this power was likewise attributed to Jesus by the Evangelists to add lustre to His Messiahship. ⁴ We are concerned here, says STRAUSS, with a sea anecdote, just as those with which Pythagoras had already been credited. For his explanation STRAUSS has one eye on the Old Testament and the other on the ancient world.

From the phenomenological point of view this nature miracle brings us into the interesting field of "weather magic." When dis-

¹ PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, I, 2, p. 469 ff.

² VON AMMON, *Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu*, I, p. 393: "So wird die geschichtliche Ansicht dieses Ereignisses eine moralische und die moralische eine religiöse; denn nur der mit Gott in seinem Innern befreundete Mensch ist über den Kampf der Elemente und der empörten Natur selbst erhaben." HUNTER, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, p. 58. As regards the nature miracles: "here we may try rationalisation." It may be that "what Jesus stilled was not the gale of wind on the Lake but the storm of fear in the disciples' hearts." But see TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 99.

³ KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 269 f.: "The present writer witnessed such a change while sailing on the Sea in the spring of 1912."

⁴ STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 179: "Dass ein solches ἐπιτίμωσι τῇ θαλάσῳ Jesu angedichtet werden konnte, dazu lag die Veranlassung im Alten Testamente."

cussing the healing miracles, we already commented that Jesus did not perform any absolutely "new" miracles, and the same holds true for miracles of this kind. This is evident from the countless:

(b) *Accounts of the subduing of water and wind*

In both the peoples of the ancient world and primitive peoples we find all kinds of examples of weather magic. Gods, "divine men," kings, priests, philosophers and magicians, all were considered capable of guiding or subduing the forces of nature. The Greek hero Heracles shot an arrow at the sun when he found it too hot. Medea, who was related to Helios, could conjure the winds with her words, as could Orpheus.¹ The deity Aristaeus averted a great disaster in Boeotia, for "when the winds which usually moistened the fruits did not blow, he easily called them back."² King Xerxes was hampered in his campaign against Greece by favourable winds summoned by the prayers and sacrifices of the Delphians.³ Antiochus Epiphanes II believed "in supernatural arrogance that he could command the waves of the sea."⁴ Cicero writes of the good fortune of Emperor Pompey; not only is his will obeyed by his enemies, "but also winds and storms prove themselves accommodating."⁵ Wise men and sorcerers also

¹ FIEDLER, *Antiker Wetterzauber*, p. 5 ff. . . . A hymn to Aesculapius runs as follows: "On the sea you kindly protected me, and you never let me be overcome by baneful calamities, but you conducted me safely when you steered my ship to Delos, smoothing the Aegean swell. Again, you rescued the shipwrecked when you made the waves in a powerful eddy rise under my little boat. You calmed the winds when the gale raged against men and surrounded them with the grim destiny of death" (*Inscriptio Pergamena*, Berl. Sitzber., 1934, p. 753 ff., see EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, p. 331 f.).

² CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Strom.*, VI, III, 29. Aesculapius, Sarapis and the Dioscuri were true saviours at sea, see BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 252 f.

³ CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *op. cit.*, VI, III, 29: "For by blowing vigorously in the vicinity of the Sepias promontory they destroyed the entire preparation of the Persian equipment." Cf. HERODOTUS, *Historiae*, VII, 178 and 188.

⁴ II Macc. 9 : 8.

⁵ CICERO, *De Imperio Cn. Pompei ad Quirites oratio*, 48: "... sed etiam venti tempestatesque obsecundarint." Cf. FIEDLER, *op. cit.*, p. 12 f.: "Und wenn Xerxes das Meer, das ihm nicht willfährig war, auspeitschen lässt (Herodot. VII, 34, Arr. Anab. VII, 14, 5 usw.), wenn Pheros, der Sohn des Sesostris, die Lanze in die vom Sturme geschwellten, hochgehenden Fluten des Nils schleudert (Herod. II, 111), spricht das nicht in gleicher Weise für eine Herrschaft über die Naturgewalten? Dieser Glaube an die wetterbezwingende Macht des Königs oder Herrschers ist aber nicht griechische oder orientalische Eigenart, sondern darf zu den bei allen Völkern verbreiteten religiösen Grundformen gerechnet werden." See also the art. *Wetterzauber* by RÜHLE in RGG, V, col. 1893 f.

possess this supernatural power. Empedocles of Agrigentum even had the sobriquet of "avertter of the winds." It is said of him that once, when a wind was blowing from Mount Agrigentum which was unhealthy for the inhabitants and made the women infertile, he caused this wind to cease blowing.¹ Weather sorcerers at Cleonae in Argolis used hymns and sacrifices to divert clouds which were about to release hail.²

Often the inclement weather or the sun was "shot at." The Roman Emperor Caligula shot at a thunderstorm to drive away the clouds and the Thracians shot at thunderclouds, at the same time uttering threats.³ The basis for these acts is the belief that nature is not shackled by unbreakable chains of cause and effect, but is governed by powers which have a certain "will;" they are therefore both element and personification. Only a stronger will than theirs is able to bind them, which can be done above all by means of certain formulas and spells. And since it is usually inclement weather that has to be conjured, it is of course evil spirits, demons, who are seen at work. This is why we everywhere encounter water spirits and demons of the air: spring, sea, rain and wind demons, etc.⁴

¹ CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Strom.*, VI, III, 30 . . . Empedocles' sobriquet was *κωλύσάνεμας*.

² CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA, *Strom.*, VI, III, 31. FIEDLER, *op. cit.*, p. 21: Empedocles deliberately invests himself with a magic nimbus. "Von Pythagoras erzählte man sich ganz ähnliche Dinge, überhaupt werden diese Wunder und Zauber zu einem 'Topos der Philosophen-legende.' Demokrit, Epimenides, Abaris, sogar Sophokles—dieser wegen seines Windhymnus—erscheinen als Wetterzauberer." . . . Hermes, the wind god, carries the bag, which artists incorrectly interpret as a money bag (p. 33).

³ FIEDLER, *op. cit.*, p. 36 f.

⁴ Cf. CANAAN, *Dämonenglaube*, p. 30 ff.; CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 44: "... auf die Annahme eines im See wohnenden Dämons weist es bereits hin, wenn Jesus Mt. 8, 26, Lk. 8, 24, wie die Winde oder den Wind . . . das Mehr bedroht." WEINREICH, *Gebet u. Wunder*, p. 220: "Fluss, Mehr, Erde, Wolke, Donner, Wald, alles ist physikalisch auffassbar und zugleich tierhaft, dämonisch, göttlich lebendig." FRAZER, *The Golden Bough*, I, 1, § 4, The magical control of the wind, pp. 319-331. "Once more, the savage thinks he can make the wind to blow or to be still" (p. 319). All over Melanesia there are "weather-doctors" who control the weather for a suitable fee. See also *Aftermath*, a supplement to *The Golden Bough*, Ch. II, pp. 68-100, where all kinds of other examples are given. Cf. AETH. ENOCH, cap. 60, which speaks of the "spirit" of the sea, which is "masculine and strong," of the "spirit" of hoar-frost, hail, snow, rain, etc. See also SJÖBERG, *TWNT*, VI, p. 373. FIEDLER, *op. cit.*, p. 45: "Bei den Eskimos können die Angekoks Stürme erregen und besänftigen. Dies geschieht durch Gebärden und Beschwörungen, in welchen der Wind oder das Meer direkt angerufen werden. Die jungen Angekoks lernen ihre Kunst von den Alten." Fiedler says that Mk. 4 : 37 recalls the power of the "sons of gods." Christ

In the Talmud there are a number of remarkable stories about the domination of wind and sea. In answer to the prayers of Rabbi Gamaliel II, ca. 90-130 A.D., a storm subsided.¹ The same happened in answer to the prayers of a Jewish lad who was travelling on a pagan ship.² FIEBIG points out that a story such as that of Rabbi Gamaliel is definitely not derived from the New Testament. "Jesus was credited with exactly that which the then Jews attributed to their rabbis."³ There are in fact a number of points of similarity between these stories, as FIEBIG remarks, but in his conclusion that "just any Jewish lad, according to this story, achieved by his faith exactly the same as Rabbi Gamaliel and, in the New Testament, Jesus," the accounts are boldly put on a par.⁴

Domination of the forces of nature was likewise attributed to

wielded a "divine force." "Der Bericht findet seinen Niederschlag in Heiligenlegenden; Heilige stehen ja mit Christus in Verbindung, sie haben ein besonderes Charisma . . ." "Die christlichen Heiligen treten an Stelle der antiken Heroen" (p. 92 f., note).

¹ Baba Mezi'a, 59b: "R. Gamaliel too was travelling in a ship, when a huge wave arose to drown him. 'It appears to me,' he reflected, 'that this is on account of none other but R. Eliezer b. Hyrcanus.' Thereupon he arose and exclaimed, 'Sovereign of the Universe! Thou knowest full well that I have not acted for my honour, nor for the honour of my paternal house, but for Thine, so that strife may not multiply in Israel!' At that the raging sea subsided" (ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman). Cf. FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 33, who dates R. Gamaliel II at ca. 90-130 A.D.

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 452, p. Berakh, 9, 13b, 22: "R. Tanchuma (um 380) hat gesagt: Einmal war ein heidnisches Schiff, auf dem sich ein jüdischer Knabe befand, hinausgefahren auf das grosse Meer. Es erhob sich ein grosser Sturm gegen sie auf dem Meere. Jeder von ihnen stand u. nahm seinen Götzen in die Hand u. schrie zu diesem; aber es nützte nichts. Als sie sahen, dass es nichts nützte, sprachen sie zu jenem Knaben: Mein Sohn, steh auf u. rufe deinen Gott an; denn wir haben gehört, dass er euch erhört . . ., wenn ihr zu ihm schreit, u. er ist mächtig. Sofort erhob sich der Knabe u. schrie von ganzem Herzen, u. Gott nahm sein Gebet an . . . u. das Meer schwieg. Als man ans Land ging, ging jeder, um seine Bedürfnisse einzukaufen. Da sagte man zu jenem Knaben: Willst du dir nicht etwas kaufen? Er antwortete: Was wollt ihr von diesem unglücklichen Fremdling? Sie sprachen: Du ein unglücklicher Fremdling? Wir sind unglückliche Fremdlinge: wir sind hier u. unser Gott ist in Babel, wir sind hier u. unser Gott ist in Rom, wir sind hier u. unser Gott ist bei uns, aber sie nützen uns nichts. Aber wohin du auch gehn magst, dein Gott ist bei dir, s.: 'Welches ist eine grosse Nation, die einen ihr so nahen Gott besässe, wie Jahve unser Gott, sooft wir zu ihm rufen?' Dt. 4, 7." Cf. FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 61 f.

³ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 35. SCHLATTER, *Das Wunder in der Synagoge*, p. 71, disputes Fiebig. With regard to the stilling of the storm by Gamaliel he says: "Ich gestehe zunächst auch diesem Stück—nicht nur keine Wahrheit, sondern auch kein Alter zu. Denn das literar-historische Bedenken, dass es erst im babylonischen Talmud auftaucht, wird hier durch sachliche Erwägungen unterstützt."

⁴ FIEBIG, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

Apollonius. People liked to travel with him in the same ship when the weather was bad. ¹

In this ancient world of ideas Christianity lived on, century after century. According to Hieronymus and Augustine the air was full of demons, whilst for Thomas Aquinas it was an established fact that the demons could cause winds, storms and a rain of fire. Luther also believed in the power of demons over water and wind. ²

The above examples could be supplemented by countless others. Must the account in the New Testament therefore be interpreted as a specimen of "weather magic," as the product of popular belief, as a "fortunate" combination of circumstances, since the storm subsided just as Jesus was speaking, or must it be viewed with STRAUSS as a means of embellishing and reinforcing Jesus' Messiahship?

One's opinion of Jesus' power over nature is closely bound up with our third point:

(c) *Comparison with Old Testament data*

The God of Israel is the God of history and Lord of nature. This is argued again and again. In the passage of the Red Sea, that so important event in Israel's history, of which we are repeatedly reminded, Yahweh manifested His power in surprising fashion. God made the sea and the rivers. ³ He stills the roaring seas. ⁴ He uses the sea as a means of punishment. ⁵ The same applies to the wind, which collaborates with the sea. ⁶ And so the power of the Lord for the good or the bad of His creatures is manifest in the elements.

¹ VITA APOLL., IV, 13: "and they all thought him to be a man superior to tempest and to fire and to peril of every nature; so they begged him to take them as his shipmates" (transl. Eells).

² Cf. STEPLINGER, *Antiker Aberglaube*, p. 72: "Unter der christlichen Kirche lebte, gestützt auf Paulus (ad Eph. 2, 2; 6, 12) der Aberglaube fort, dass böse Dämonen Hagel und Sturm erregen." In the eighth and ninth centuries this was often ascribed to magicians. See further WHITE, *Histoire de la Lutte entre la Science et la Théologie*, p. 298 f. Francis Xavier subdued a storm by throwing a crucifix into the sea; the crucifix was brought back to him later by a crab. FIEDLER, *op. cit.*, p. 17, tells how a priest from Treviso: "der bei ausbrechendem Gewitter auf der Jagd war und dasselbe nicht beschworen hatte, beim Nachhausekommen von seinen sonst sehr anhänglichen Pfarrkindern insultiert wurde. Der Priester hat die Gewalt schlechtes und gutes Wetter zu machen, Mäuse, Spatzen zu vertreiben usw."

³ Ps. 95 : 5; Am. 5 : 8; 9 : 6.

⁴ Ps. 33 : 7; 65 : 7; 77 : 16; Job. 12 : 15.

⁵ Exod. 14 : 26 ff.; Jos. 24 : 7; Jonah 1 : 4.

⁶ Ps. 107 : 25-30; 147 : 18; Pro. 30 : 4; Job 28 : 25; Am. 4 : 13; Nah. 1 : 3, 4; wind as a means of punishment in Isa. 27 : 8; Hos. 13 : 15; Jonah 1 : 4.

DE GROOT-HULST have defined the action of God, the revelation of God in Power and Will, as follows. "It is God who continually intervenes. He is not a god who once, at the remote beginning, started a piece of machinery which has worked automatically since then, but He is the personal God, the living God, who for that very reason at all times and in all fields has the situation in hand, prepares the way, fulfils the moments."¹

VRIEZEN, too, stresses that God is not a "Being": "but a personal Power, who consciously effects salvation in the world". . . "Israel met its God as a living God, who manifested Himself in the history of the people and in personal life. It learned to know God as a saviour and leader, as the Redeemer-God." Everything in nature exists through God. "All life is from Him and in Him. It may even be said that what we call the creative force of nature is, to the Israelite, God. Hence, everywhere that special forces are manifest in nature, God is seen to be acting. His voice is heard in the thunder, His power is revealed in the storm, His life-giving force is manifest in plant and animal. And so nature is the revelation of the fullness of His being."² It is GRUNDMANN's merit that in this "Power" of God he has pointed to the threads linking the Old and the New Testament, remarking that: "we therewith hit upon one of the most important elements of the concept of God in the New Testament. . . The Father of Jesus Christ and thus the God of the New Testament is the God of Moses and the prophets."³ Where the revelation of God was the issue, the forces of nature were used. This was so with the passage of the Red Sea. That was why Moses smote the waters of the Nile, Ex. 7 : 20. That was how the people of Israel crossed the Jordan, Jos. 3, 4. That was how Elijah made his way through the Jordan, 2 Ki. 2 : 8.

¹ DE GROOT-HULST, *Macht en Wil*, p. 30. Cf. p. 66: "It is He who sustains creation and leads history; not only the history of His own people, but also that of the pagans." God is: "all action" (p. 165). He is not "a pale abstraction," but the Mighty One who says "I" (p. 189; cf. p. 209 ff.).

² See VRIEZEN, *Hoofddijnen der Theologie v.h. O.T.*, Ch. VII, God, under F, God as Creator, Redeemer and Sustainer, pp. 195-206. . . . Of great importance is Vriezen's remark that God and nature are not identical or related; God does not merge into nature; neither man nor nature is "divine," but God is "Lord over all things and all persons" (p. 203). Cf. BRAUN, *TWNT*, VI, p. 456 ff., on the ποτεῖν, the "doing" of God. "Ein beträchtlicher Teil der über 3200 ποτεῖν-Stellen der LXX handelt von Gottes Tun." God is "active" in every field.

³ GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestam. Gedankenwelt*, p. 11 ff. "Jahwes Kraft ist in eminentem Masse Geschichtskraft, geschichtsbildende, geschichtsgestaltende Kraft" (p. 14).

GRUNDMANN recalls the might that was attributed in the Old Testament to the Messiah and points out how the power of Christ found its example in that of the prophets.¹

Nature was subservient to Jesus Christ, to whom "all power" had been given.

(d) *Jesus as master of the forces of nature*

The account of the stilling of the storm is often compared with the story in Jonah 1 : 1-17. According to GOPPELT, the description of the situation and a number of verbal conformities indicate that the Evangelist had the story of Jonah clearly in mind.² PERELS argues that in both form and material there is a great gulf between the accounts. In Jonah no miracle-worker is in action, and the whole structure of the story of Jonah's vicissitudes differs from that of the New Testament account.³ It remains possible that the author, in his description, was influenced by his familiarity with the story of Jonah, but PERELS has rightly pointed out that the stories do in fact differ thoroughly from one another. It is therefore not correct, in our opinion, to try and derive the story of the stilling of the storm directly from an example in the Old Testament.

We fear that the "echo" of the Babylonian deluge story which Beer believes that he hears in the stilling of the storm will not ring in everyone's ears! ⁴

Just as Yahweh threatened and subdued the sea and the winds, so the Son threatened and subdued the forces which "spend them-

¹ GRUNDMANN, op. cit., p. 55: "Schon die alttestamentliche Messiaserwartung weiss von der Kraft des Messias." Cf. Ps. 110 : 2; Isa 9 : 5; 11 : 2; Micah 5 : 3 . . . "Das neutestamentliche Kerygma kennt die Kraft und Macht des Christus" (p. 57). Cf. Lk. 24 : 19.

² GOPPELT, Typos, p. 84. Cf. Jonah 1 : 4 with Mk. 4 : 37; Jonah 1 : 5 with Mk. 4 : 38; Jonah 1 : 6 with Mk. 4 : 38; Jonah 1 : 11 with Mk. 4 : 39; Jonah 1 : 16 with Mk. 4 : 41. "Dem bibelkundigen Evangelisten mussten bei der Beschreibung dieser Vorgänge die ihm vertrauten atl. Wendungen in die Feder fliessen" (p. 85). Cf. HAUCK, Markus. GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 169: "... the framework of the stilling of the storm is based on the story of Jonah."

³ PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 78. . . . BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 250, sees a connection between all these stories. "Dass hier eine fremde Wundergeschichte auf Jesus übertragen ist, scheint mir nicht zweifelhaft zu sein."

⁴ According to Beer, *Theol. Jahresbericht*, 1906, 14: "dass in der Geschichte von Jesu Seefahrt und wunderbarer Stillung des Sturmes ein Nachhall von der babylonischen Sintflut zu spüren sei;" see CLEMEN, *Religionsgesch. Erklär. des N.T.*, p. 214.

selves as forces of will in the elemental fury of nature.”¹ STAUFFER’s expression “forces of will” means that Jesus “addressed” the raging storm as a “force” threatening Him and His disciples. When SCHLEIERMACHER remarks that a word can do nothing against the fury of a storm, he is naturally quite correct,² but it must be realized that here as it were two “forces” are set against one another. The force of the sea was “muzzled,” silenced, shut up.³

The fact that Jesus addressed the natural elements is often associated with the “demoniac” atmosphere of sea and wind. Jesus is believed to have subdued the “devils” who had a hand in this storm. GREYDANUS, for instance, concludes from Lk. 8 : 30 ff. that there were many devils on “the other side,” and then says: “The idea that the might of devils was active in this storm is therefore obvious.”⁴ However, we share KLOSTERMANN’s opinion that, al-

¹ STAUFFER, TWNT, II, p. 623: “Die Elemente haben ihren Meister gefunden... Der Christus ist wieder Gebieter, wieder Herr und König der Natur” . . . Cf. TERTULLIAN, Adv. Marc., IV, 20, who draws Marcion’s attention to the prophecies of Christ’s feats in the Old Testament. “When the sea is driven back in response to his threats, Nahum’s prophecy is fulfilled. ‘He rebuketh the sea, and maketh it dry,’ it is said, of course with the winds by which it was made restless” (Cum ad minas eius eliditur mare, Naum quoque absolvitur. Comminans, inquit, mari et arefaciens illud, utique cum ventis, quibus inquietabatur). REYMOND, L’eau, sa vie et sa signification dans l’Ancien Testament, sees in the account of the stilling of the storm: “le récit de l’apaisement d’une mer qui n’a pas accepté encore sa totale soumission puisqu’elle essaie de se rebeller contre le *κύριος* (Marc IV 35-41 et parallèles); et la conclusion qui met en évidence le fait que Jésus commande même aux vents et aux flots doit être entendue avec toute sa résonnance cosmique” (p. 195).

² SCHLEIERMACHER, Das Leben Jesu, p. 230: “Das ist ein Fall, glaube ich, wo man sich nicht anders als mit einer solchen Ausnahme helfen kann, dass das nicht wirklich Worte Christi an das Meer sind . . .”

³ Mk. 4 : 39. *φειλόω* = to fit the mouth with a muzzle; to tie up; to silence. BLASS-DEBRUNNER, Neutest. Gramm. § 346 (p. 153) and Part II, p. 57: *πεφίλωσο* is “feierliche Beschwörungsformel” . . . EITREM, Demonology, p. 31: “. . . the roaring storm has to ‘shut up.’ This use is something more than a simple ‘Binde-formel,’ a *καταδεσμός*, as scholars after Rhode are inclined to understand it.” See He. 11 : 33. DIBELIUS, Die Formgeschichte, p. 87: “mit den Worten, ‘er bedrohte den Wind’ soll wohl eine Geste geschildert werden,” cf. Aesculapius’ gesture at sea. According to KEULERS, Mattheüs, Jesus addressed the sea “as if it were a naughty child.” This explanation is really rather childish. TAYLOR, The Life and Ministry of Jesus, p. 99 f., considers Jesus’ speaking to the elements “in harmony with his use of hyperbole in his saying about the uprooting and removal of a mountain, ‘Be taken up and cast into the sea’ (Mk. XI. 23).”

⁴ GREYDANUS, Lukas . . . BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, Markus, who wishes to bring to the fore what Mark tried to proclaim, is prepared to “have a try” at understanding Mark to some extent. “Wind and water are ‘forces’ or rather instruments of forces; living beings roar in the wind and ride the waves as horses.” In Mark the storm is “an attack by the demons on the sleeper.”

though wind and water demons were believed in, care should be taken with the drawing of conclusions.¹

Jesus resisted a "force" which at that moment formed a threat to life in its outburst. However, this in no way means that according to Jesus this force was evil in its whole being and consequences! It seems to us that one can hardly describe the sea and storm as being inimical to God.² Nor is the fury of nature as such directed towards the ensnaring and the downfall of man, as for instance is definitely the case with disease. It is for this reason that we object to DEHN's view of the storm as a kind of "disease" of nature. DEHN speaks of a sick nature "which wrongly breaks through its bounds" and of a raging nature "that merely seeks itself."³ Remarks of this kind are fine in edifying rhetoric, but are highly questionable in exegesis. For who will ever be able to diagnose the "diseases" of nature? The same weather conditions which threaten the one and are to his disadvantage may favour the other. But leprosy, mental disease and the like are equally dangerous for all people!

In the account of the stilling of the storm we are told, to put it briefly, that Jesus is the "living Lord." What is true of Yahweh is also true of Him, viz. that He "at all times and in all fields has the situation in hand" (De Groot-Hulst). The subduing of the storm was therefore not meant as a demonstration of power, but made Jesus known to His disciples as saviour/redeemer in all circumstances. It is in this sense, i.e. in its functional nature, as a salutary force, that this nature miracle must be interpreted first of all. In the proclamation it becomes for the faithful a sign of Jesus' saving power of love.

¹ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*. "Dass der Wind als Dämon aufgefasst sei 'wie überall in Folklore,' ist eine naheliegende Annahme, wenn auch nicht unbedingt zu folgern; nach Mc befiehlt Jesus ja auch sonst unbelebten Objekten 11, 14.23." But see NOACK, *Satanas u. Soteria*, p. 67: this view remains an uncertain supposition. Threatening of inanimate objects does not occur elsewhere in the New Testament. "Das N.T.—und besonders die Synopse—interessiert sich für die Dämonen nur als Urheber von Krankheiten."

² K. BARTH has given lengthy consideration to the enmity to God which in his opinion was present in sea and storm according to the Biblical witness; see for this the next chapter: *Jesus' Walking on the Water*.

³ DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*, wonders how the stilling of the storm must be interpreted. As *theologia gloriae* or otherwise? "Man könnte sie in Parallele stellen zu den Krankenheilungen Jesu. Er tut hier an der Natur das Gleiche, was er sonst an kranken Menschen getan hat." Raging nature: "ist ihm dämonische, mit Unrecht ihre Schranken durchbrechende, kranke Natur... Er wirft ein Panier des Reiches Gottes auf mitten in der ungebundenen, Gottentfremdeten, nur sich selbst suchenden Naturgewalt."

It is known that the lovers of symbolism and allegory have for centuries eagerly flung themselves on this miracle. Sea and wind, ship and sleep yield an eminently suitable quantity of material for the construction of grandiose and grotesque figures. But when the fishing boat which was once in distress on the Sea of Galilee is converted into the "ship of the Church," it should be realized that this conversion is effected purely and simply in the ship-yard of the imagination! ¹

¹ DEHN, op. cit., says with respect to this: "Die von Anfang an gekannte und beliebte Deutung der Geschichte auf das Schiff der Kirche, das durch alle Stürme sicher hindurchkommt, hat im Text selbst keinerlei Anhaltspunkte." BORNKAMM, *Die Sturmstillung im Matthäus-Evangelium* (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., pp. 48-53), believes that Matthew has given a new meaning to this pericope. Note the ἀκολουθεῖν in Mt. 8: 19 and 22 and in v. 23, where it likewise has a deeper significance. Matthew is the oldest and the first exegete: "der die Sturmfahrt der Jünger mit Jesus und die Stillung des Sturmes auf die Nachfolge und damit auf das Schiffein der Kirche deutet." Cf. HELD, *Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch.* (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev.). "Der Evangelist zeichnet in die Geschichte von der Sturmstillung das Bild der nachfolgenden Kirche hinein," pp. 192; 255 f. MÁNEK, *Fishers of Men*, gathers from the account that the Church must remain "above the water" . . . "The Church is above the water when she prays for the presence of her Lord and when He is awake in the midst of her" (p. 141).

XVI. JESUS' WALKING ON THE WATER

Introduction

The second nature miracle in which Jesus reveals His powers over the elements, like that of the stilling of the storm, is connected with the Sea of Galilee.¹ It differs in character from the stilling of the storm in that not merely the "word," but the whole person of Jesus Himself is involved: Jesus walks across the water. The accounts by Matthew, Mark and John disagree with one another on various points. However, they present an important point of similarity in the context; in all three the crossing of the Sea is described immediately after the miraculous feeding, which points to a certain form of tradition.²

Matthew and Mark begin their account by stating that Jesus "constrained" the disciples to get into the boat, saying that He would send away the multitude. The reason for this compulsion is not given. One can guess the reason from the Johannine account: the people were trying to make Jesus king by force. Neither the point of departure nor the landing place can be accurately established. According to Matthew Jesus commanded His disciples to sail "unto the other side;" Mark says "unto Bethsaida," while John gives "Capernaum" as the destination. Matthew 14 : 34 and Mark 6 : 53 speak of the party disembarking in Gennesaret. Attempts have been made in various ways to find a solution, in which for instance the possibility of a head-wind has been taken into account, but it is not possible to say exactly where the boat landed.³ Whilst

¹ Mt. 14 : 22-33; Mk. 6 : 45-52; Jn. 6 : 16-21. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 68, classifies this account among the "Novellen." PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker*, p. 54 f., states that Mt. 14 : 22-33 really comprises two miracles. The climax is lacking. BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 231, says that this story could be regarded as a variant of the account of the stilling of the storm. However, the original motif is the walking on the water: "zu dem das Sturmmotiv (aus 4, 37-41) sekundär hinzugekommen ist." Bultmann classifies this story among the "Wundergeschichten."

² Cf. SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 193. According to STAUFFER, *Jesus Gestalt u. Geschichte*, the account is: "unzertrennlich mit der Speisungsgeschichte vom Frühjahr 31 verknüpft." For that reason it is not a "verkannte Ostergeschichte." In Mk. 6 : 49: "kämpft der Evangelist offenbar gegen eine polemische Berichterstattung, die das Ganze als eine Gespenstergeschichte abtun möchte . . ." (p. 137).

³ For details see among others DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 184 ff.; ALLEN,

Jesus was on "the mountain" praying alone, His disciples were toiling in the evening, trying to make headway with the boat. According to Matthew they were not without success in this, since the boat was "now in the midst of the sea" when Jesus appeared, whilst John says that they "had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs." A furlong being one eighth of a mile, they had thus rowed about three to four miles. Mark states that "when even was come, the ship was in the midst of the sea."¹

Now whilst the disciples were exerting themselves to reach the opposite shore, Jesus came to them, "walking upon the sea." Matthew and Mark state that the time of Jesus' appearance was "the fourth watch of the night," i.e. about three a.m.²

Whereas so far the accounts have been more or less identical, we now get considerable differences. According to Matthew: "in the fourth watch of the night Jesus went unto them, walking on the sea." It may be deduced from this that it was Jesus' intention to join His disciples. Mark says: "And he saw them toiling in rowing; for the wind was contrary unto them: and about the fourth watch of the night he cometh unto them, walking upon the sea, and would have passed by them." This may mean that Jesus saw His disciples toiling from the shore, which was quite feasible in moonlight, so that "supernatural" powers of sight need not be envisaged. But when it is stated

St. Matthew. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 231: "Mt 14, 22 lässt den Namen der Stadt fallen, wohl, weil der Sturm in der Nacht das Schiff doch aus dieser geplanten Richtung abdrängte." KEULERS, *Mattheüs*. Keulers thinks that the difficulty can be easily solved if it is assumed that Mark states the destination of the trip, whilst John says where they actually ended up as a result of the head-wind, viz. Capernaum. When Gennesaret, Mt. 14 : 34, Mk. 6 : 53, is mentioned as landing place, one must not think of a town, but of the plain which extended for about three miles between Capernaum and Tiberias along the western shore of the Sea of Galilee.

¹ Mk. 6 : 47, ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης. Various manuscripts also state in Mt. 14 : 24 that the boat was "in the midst of the sea" . . . At quite an early date opponents of Christianity cast a critical eye on this account. According to Julian in that area there is no lake to be found, any more than there is a high mountain in a desert (BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 456, Julian ed. Neumann 235 Fgm. 5), while Porphyry says that there is no sea there: "but a little pool, formed from a river, at the foot of the mountain, along the land of Galilee, near the town of Tiberias, which can be crossed in no more than two hours, even with small boats, whilst it offers space neither for waves nor storms" (see VON HARNACK, *Porphyrius*, p. 81. Macarius Magnes, III, 6. Cf. also BAUER, *op. cit.*, p. 456).

² Like Babylon and Ancient Greece, Israel divided the night into three parts, each of four hours. The Romans divided the night into four. This Roman subdivision was current among the Jews, cf. Mk. 13 : 35. See STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 688 ff.

as the motive for Jesus' journey that He saw His disciples toiling — for the text can hardly be read otherwise — what does the addition “and would have passed by them” mean? For that is how the text is usually translated.¹ Some believe that we must envisage a trial of the disciples' faith, just as the woman of Canaan and the men of Emmaus were put to the test, see Lk. 24 : 28.² Others presume that it was Jesus' intention to overtake the disciples, so as to surprise them on the other side.³ Various exegetes are of the opinion that we are concerned here with a theophany: the miraculous journey across the Sea was not really meant for human eyes.⁴ BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL seeks the solution in the idea that what Jesus intends does not happen. “There is nothing planned, nothing scheduled in Jesus' way of acting as described here.” Jesus again and again accepts “the circumstances as a living conversation with God, full of surprising turns.”⁵

BRUCE thinks that the disciples had the impression that Jesus wanted to pass them, whilst VAN LEEUWEN comments that the real reason is unknown to us.⁶

None of these explanations can in fact be called satisfactory. Now as the usual translation involves an appreciable contradiction, it may be wondered whether the text perhaps permits of another translation. We believe that this is in fact possible, and that the trans-

¹ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*, translates καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς, Mk. 6 : 48, by: “und er war im Begriff an ihnen vorbeizugehen.” MOFFATT, *The New Testament*: “He would have passed them by.”

² KEULERS, *Marcus en Lucas . . . Loisy's view that this is a “childish game”* is rightly condemned by Keulers.

³ According to Strauss and Wellhausen, see KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markus-evangelium*.

⁴ According to Windisch, see KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*. Cf. SCHNEIDER, *TWNT*, II, p. 679. As in Lk. 18 : 37, this might be an “epiphanes Zeichen:” “das in einem scheinbar zufälligen Augenblick die messianische Macht und Hoheit Jesu enthüllt.” DEHN, *Der Gottessohn*, sees an important datum in: “would have passed by them.” The Son of God crosses the Sea in divine ecstasy. “Das ist kein Schauspiel für irdische Augen, das ist ein Daherstürmen in dem Geheimnis göttlichen Seins, von dem niemand etwas wissen darf als Gott und Gottes Sohn allein . . . DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 92. Cf. p. 277. ALBERTZ, *Die Botschaft des NT*, I, 1, p. 137: “Das Wunder des Wandeln auf dem See ist nach Mk 6, 48 für die Augen der Jünger nicht bestimmt, also kein Propagandawunder, doch beruhigt Jesus die Jünger, die dieses Anblicks teilhaftig geworden sind, durch seinen Zuspruch, dass sie nicht an diesem theophanischen Wunder zu sterben brauchen Mk 6, 45-52.”

⁵ BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, *Markus*.

⁶ BRUCE, *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, I: “it appeared so to them.” VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*.

lation "for he would have passed their way" may eliminate the difficulties. In our opinion there is not a single objection to this translation from the grammatical point of view.¹ It introduces cohesion and equilibrium into the account. Mark has just said that Jesus went to the disciples, now he explains how Jesus did this. He did not want to "pass" them — it is precisely this idea which does not fit into the text as a whole — but He wanted to reveal His presence to His disciples by passing their way.

The interpretation suggested by us does not exclude the idea of a theophany. However, it is not a divine appearance which may not be seen by human eyes, but one that happened for the very purpose of being seen! In wonderful fashion Jesus put His authority at the service of His disciples; His revelation was the revelation of salvation. However, the disciples reacted not with rejoicings but with terror and fear.² It was the same reaction as after the stilling of the storm, Mk. 4 : 41. Now when it became evident to Jesus that His appearance as such had given the disciples a feeling of terror and discomfort, and not of joy and security, He spoke words of encouragement to them "straightway" — both Matthew and Mark convey this idea, Mark using "immediately," from which it may be derived that Jesus was not far from the boat. To release them fully from the thought that He was a "spirit" — it was popularly believed that the spirits of the night brought disaster — He did not only speak, but also "went up unto them into the ship; and the wind ceased," Mk. 6 : 51. It is not necessary here to envisage an additional, a second miracle; the abatement of the wind may simply be ascribed to natural causes.

The three Evangelists each conclude their account in individual fashion. Mark ends his version with the statement that the disciples were "sore amazed in themselves beyond measure," Mk. 6 : 51. He associates this result with their lack of understanding, which had already been evident in the miraculous feeding; their "heart" was hardened.

¹ We therefore do not take the particle "and," καί, in the sense of a coordination, but in an explicative sense: Jesus' "coming" is further explained in the subordinate clause. "And" thus has the meaning here of: for, namely. Cf. Mt. 8 : 33 (they told every thing, viz. of the possessed); Ro. 1 : 5 (grace, viz. apostleship). See BLASS-DEBRUNNER, *Neutest. Gramm.*, § 442, 9; BAUER, *Griech.-deu. Wörterbuch* . . . In the suggested translation v. 48 forms a composite whole: when Jesus saw that the disciples were wearing themselves out, he already felt the desire to pass their way. The standard translation, on the other hand, creates the impression of an independent, more or less isolated statement, relating solely to the moment of passing by.

² Mt. 14 : 26; Mk. 6 : 49; Jn. 6 : 19.

As regards the state of mind of the disciples, the account thus ends on a negative note.

Matthew has an entirely different ending. First he tells of the Peter episode, which occurs only in his Gospel, and then the story displays an upward trend, concluding with the worship by the disciples: "Of a truth thou art the Son of God."

John too ends his account in quite another way. "Then they willingly received him into the ship: and immediately the ship was at the land whither they went," Jn. 6 : 21. Not a word is said here about the stilling of the wind. Furthermore, it is not clear whether Jesus climbed into the boat or not. The pros and cons of the latter have often been argued, and the difference of opinion also finds expression in the various translations.¹ The words "and immediately the ship was at the land" need not be regarded as an exaggeration of the miracle, since they may mean a rapid and favourable way on the boat.² From what John further writes, see Jn. 6 : 25, it becomes evident that the multitude were astonished at the presence of Jesus on the other side: "Rabbi, when camest thou hither?"³

The account of the stilling of the storm confronted us with many a question; here the problems accumulate to no less an extent. We should like to consider them by means of the following points:

- (a) Analogous stories.
- (b) Old Testament data.
- (c) Various explanations.
- (d) The Peter episode.
- (e) Conclusions.

¹ Cf. the commentaries for the arguments. The opinion held by Chrysostom and others, viz. that Jesus refused to enter the boat and walked across the water to the shore (see KEULERS, Joannes), is definitely far-fetched.

² UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes*: "in less than no time they reached the coast." Cf. BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 119 f. KEULERS, Joannes, says that many think here of a new miracle, but that a successful voyage may also be envisaged. On the other hand BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, says: "... zum Wunder des Seewandelns kommt also noch die wunderbare Landung" (p. 159). Bultmann points to analogous marvellously quick landings in the literature of miracles. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 89. John does not mean: "dass sich der Vorgang im seichten Wasser am Ufer abgespielt habe, Jesu Seewandeln also überhaupt kein Wunder sei. Vielmehr gesellt sich zu dem Wunder des Seewandelns das Wunder der schnellen Fahrt: sobald Jesus sich naht, erreichen sie den sichern Strand."

³ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 160, sees in vv. 22 and 25: "das typische Motiv der Wunderbeglaubigung." The people must: "zum Zeugen für das Wunder werden."

(a) *Analogous stories.*

In the miracle literature of all kinds of peoples we encounter stories in which gods and men — prophets, those endowed with mana, saints — are credited with the power of walking on seas and rivers. With regard to the New Testament account, REITZENSTEIN therefore says that walking on the sea is one of the “very general miraculous works expected of prophets.”¹ Human imagination has had a heyday in the strangest of stories. The gods as it were played with the elements, like the Greek god Poseidon: “draped, and swiftly but softly striding over the surface of the sea, a peaceful ruler of the realm of billows.”² The deity Dionysus led his followers across the river Hydaspes after a victory over the Eastern barbarians.³ A grotesque tale is that told by a certain Cleodemos about a foreigner from the land of the barbarians, a Hyperborean, whom he, Cleodemos, saw with his own eyes by daylight flying through the air, walking on water and passing through fire.⁴ We

¹ REITZENSTEIN, *Hellen. Wundererzählungen*, p. 125. BIELER, *op. cit.*, says that walking on water is regarded: “als typischer Beweis der Göttlichkeit.” The theios aner, the divine man: “übt zunächst Herrschaft über die unbelebte Natur, über die Elemente vor allem — fast durchwegs zum Heile der Menschen” (p. 103) . . . In his eulogy of Aesculapius, Aristides, *Oratio*, XLII, 1-15 (see the Greek text and the English translation in EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius*, I, p. 155 ff.), says the following: “Now I have heard some people saying that, when they were at sea and in the midst of a storm, the god appeared to them and stretched forth his hand; others again will tell how they settled their affairs following the advice of the god.” See also GRANT, *Miracle and the Natural Law*, p. 178.

² J. M. ROBERTSON, *Christianity and Mythology*, p. 358, who quotes from K. O. Müller, *Ancient Art*, p. 432 . . . “To the child-like imagination of the early Christists, or to the cult-building ingenuity of their leaders, all such representations were so much natural matter for the construction of their own mythology” (p. 359).

³ See SAINTYVES, *Essais de Folklore Biblique*, p. 336 f., who quotes from Nonnos, *Les Dionysiaques*, XXIII, trad. de Marcellus, Paris, 1856, IV, 6. “Après ce premier triomphe sur les barbares de l’Orient, le chœur des bacchantes traverse les eaux tranquilles du fleuve à l’aide des prodiges divers de la navigation. Le dieu les guide; il dirige des chars terrestres dans cette route nouvelle pour eux; et les pieds de ses panthères s’appuient sur l’Hydaspe sans s’y mouiller. Pan, le Parrhasien, court de ses pieds de chèvre à la surface du fleuve aplani; Lycos, habitué à conduire le char à quatre chevaux de son père sans effleurer les mers, mène ses coursiers à travers les flots. Celmis, à côté de son frère Damnamème, chevauche sur les ondes calmées; Argos, sautant sur le dos d’un taureau aussi rapide que l’ouragan, le dirige vers le passage avec sa houlette, et grave les ongles d’un bœuf sur les eaux silencieuses. Les vieux silènes qui flottent sur la mer rament des pieds et des mains sur l’Hydaspe.”

⁴ LUCIANUS, *Philopseudes*, 13. Cleodemos at first also refused to believe all kinds of miracle stories, until he saw the Hyperborean perform his magic arts with his own eyes. “What else could I do when I saw him flying through the

encounter similar stories in the writings of the Parsees. It is told in the Avesta that Zoroaster, having arrived at the shore of the river Araxes with his parents, found no boat there. Having regard to his companions, he at first wanted to turn back, but "upon his having wept before the deity, his prayer was heard and he walked on the waters with all the persons who had followed him. They crossed the river without removing their clothes, like a ship cleaves the water. You would have said that Zoroaster had built a bridge for them."¹ The Chinese deity Ho-kou, the "Immortal of the waters," long lived in the shape of a mandarin's daughter, "gliding over the water of the river."² A Finnish god wandered for eight years over the vast reaches of the sea.³

SAINTYVES, who has unearthed a fine selection of examples from the literature, points to similar stories from folklore. He recalls a Flemish story about a princess whose carriage: "having arrived at the beach, enters the waves and glides over the calm surface as if it was travelling on terra firma."⁴ Hagiography lists a whole procession of saints to whose faith and prayers the elements are said to have yielded.⁵ We find similar stories among the Mohammedans.⁶ Not only gods and saints, but also the devil rode horseback "on the sea as on a well-laid road."⁷

Such persons did not only have the ability to walk on seas and rivers; their powers extended still further, for they could make waters

air whilst it was day, and saw him walking on water and passing easily through fire?" See BETZ, *Lukian von Samosata und das N.T.*, p. 166 f.

¹ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 337. Quotation from Anquetil du Perron, *Zend Avesta*. P., 1771, I, 2, pp. 19-20.

² SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 309.

³ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 315: "Le vieux, le brave Wainâmöinen erra pendant six hivers, pendant sept étés; huit ans il fut vagabond sur les plaines de la mer et les immenses détroits; sous lui l'onde bouillonne et au-dessus de sa tête le ciel déroule son azur." Quotation from Kalevala, I, I, trad. Léouzon le Duc dans la *Finlande*. P. 1845, I, 4-5 and 7.

⁴ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 316. Quotation from Charles Deulin, *Contes d'un buveur de bière*, p. 25.

⁵ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 350 f. . . Cf. the account from folklore: "Les gens de Carnoët racontaient que jadis saint Mandé se rendait régulièrement le jour de sa fête, à la chapelle qu'il possède dans cette commune, monté sur un cheval blanc et traversait la mer, depuis l'Irlande jusqu'en Bretagne" (p. 316).

⁶ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 354: "Dans l'Islam des rivages méditerranéens, Asie et Afrique, il n'est pas rare de rencontrer des sanctuaires, dont les saints possesseurs ont marché sur les eaux."

⁷ SAINTYVES, *op. cit.*, p. 317. This is according to the account of a fisherman, see F. M. Luzel, *Veillées bretonnes*, p. 106.

dry up, hold them back or open a way through them. The Egyptian goddess Isis, in her wrath, caused a river to dry up completely.¹ A path opened through rivers in answer to the prayers of many a saint.²

Indian literature also contains such stories. A legend tells of an Indian courtesan who once held back the waters of the Ganges.³ When a group of warriors had to cross a couple of rivers, a poet offered the following prayer: "Hear the singer, o sisters! From afar have I come to you with war chariots and wagons. Bend yourself, make yourself easy to cross; hold back your waves, o rivers, from the wagon axles." The singer's prayer was answered.⁴

In the Talmud miracles of this kind are also ascribed to the rabbis. In order to lend force to his authority vis-à-vis other scholars, Rabbi Eliezer performed a number of miracles, one of which was to make a stream of water run back.⁵ Upon the death of many a rabbi all kinds of strange events took place, including the cleaving of the Sea of Galilee.⁶ All these examples prove that not only in the countries fringing the Mediterranean, but also in India, China, Finland, among the Hottentots and the Zulus, throughout the world, in fact, the belief is encountered that gods and men can dominate and subdue the elements.⁷

¹ SAINTYVES, op. cit., p. 323. See Plutarch, On Isis and Osiris, cap. 16.

² SAINTYVES, op. cit., p. 325: "Saint Ange du Mont Carmel, se trouvant dans la nécessité de traverser le Jourdain, commande aux eaux de lui livrer passage 'au nom du Père, du fils et du Saint-Esprit et par les mérites des saints patriarches Elie et Elisée.'" The miracle happened. Similar accounts are given of saints Theodore, Gebhard, Gerard, Felix, etc.

³ SAINTYVES, op. cit., p. 338.

⁴ SAINTYVES, op. cit., p. 340. Quotation from the Rig-Veda, III, 33, 9; trad. A. Langlois, III, II, IV, 9-13. P. 1872, p. 212.

⁵ Baba Mezi'a 59b: "again he said to them: 'If the halachah agrees with me, let the stream of water prove it!' Whereupon the stream of water flowed backwards. 'No proof can be brought from a stream of water' they rejoined" (transl. H. Freedman).

⁶ See FIEBIG, op. cit., p. 57 ff. j. Aboda Zara, Ch. III, includes the following: "Als Rabbi Hanina von Berat Hiwarn (oder Horon) entschlafen war, spaltete sich das Meer von Tiberias. Man sagte: als er hinaufstieg zur Festsetzung des Schaltjahres, spaltete sich das Meer vor ihm." These miracle stories date back to the time of the amoraim, i.e. after 200 A.D.

⁷ SAINTYVES, op. cit., p. 323: "Notre trait, en tous cas, est commun en Afrique et paraît bien y être très ancien. Le dieu Heitsie Eibib chez les Hottentots, étant poursuivi, arrive près d'un cours d'eau et s'écrie: 'Père de mon Grand-Père, ouvre-toi que je puisse traverser et referme-toi aussitôt.' On rapporte de semblables histoires chez les Zoulous."

(b) *Old Testament data*

The Old Testament repeatedly mentions the power of Yahweh over seas and rivers, storms and thunder.¹ Consequently man need not be afraid, however sea and river might rage. It is nowhere said in the Old Testament that people walked on water. But we do encounter three accounts which describe how a path through water was followed, viz. the passage of the Red Sea, Ex. 14 : 21-31; the passing of the Israelites over Jordan, Joshua 3 and 4, and Elisha's crossing of the same river, 2 Ki. 2 : 11-14.

It is understandable that since time immemorial a connection has been envisaged between these Old Testament data and Jesus' feat. And there is an essential connection, too, but it can be interpreted in different ways.

(c) *Various explanations*

We shall start with STRAUSS' view. In his continual controversy with Paulus — see below — and adhering firmly to his own method of a mythical explanation, this scholar also endeavours to link Jesus' walking on the Sea of Galilee to the Old Testament data. For the explanation of this miracle, says STRAUSS, we shall have to bear in mind such examples as 2 Ki. 2 : 14 (Elisha's crossing of the Jordan), 2 Ki. 6 : 6 (the iron that "did swim") and Job 9 : 8 ("and treadeth upon the waves of the sea"). Then we must consider the miracle-workers of Jesus' own time, who are described by Lucianus and by Iamblichus in his "Life of Pythagoras," and "then the possibility comes to the fore that from all these elements and motives a similar saga could also form about Jesus, much greater than that of an actual event of this kind."² TRAUB, too, wants to cling to the Old Testament background of the story: the historical facts which lie behind the lake stories can no longer be exactly identified.³ Although there is a real connection between the Old Testament proclamation and Jesus' walking on the water — of which more will be said presently — it is impossible to distil the New Testament accounts from the Old Testament without

¹ See the chapter: The Stilling of the Storm. Cf. BARTH, K.D., III, 1, p. 161 ff.

² STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 192. "Auch daran müssen wir uns erinnern, dass bei seiner Taufe im Jordan Jesus diese Eigenschaften nicht zeigte, sondern ordentlich wie ein anderer Mensch untertauchte" (p. 183). Here we have the sarcastic Strauss!

³ TRAUB, *Die Wunder im N.T.*, p. 56 ff.

more ado. KEULERS rightly says: "The resemblance to the Old Testament is too vague to decide that they are interdependent."¹

PAULUS, whom Strauss combats from page to page, is of the opinion that we are concerned here with an ordinary natural fact, which has been distorted into a miracle in the story. He offers the following reconstruction: Jesus was walking along the shore, which projected somewhat above the lake, so that the disciples could see Him.² They got the impression that this was a demoniac appearance, which Jesus could not have foreseen; that was why He did not pass them, but reassured them. PAULUS concludes from both the philological meaning of the words and the topography that there was no question of walking on the lake, and that the Evangelists did not have this in mind at all.³ Paulus won many a supporter for this naturalistic theory: for by such arguments the Gospel was salvaged naturally and rationally! F. BARTH considers it possible — though not proved — that Jesus' walking on the Sea was originally walking on the shore.⁴

MACKINNON draws attention to the mental state of the disciples: they had been struggling against a head-wind, and were tired and down-hearted, so that it was understandable that they believed they were seeing a phantom, "but which is, in reality, the moving figure

¹ KEULERS, *Mattheüs*.

² PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, II, p. 243: "Allein, die im Schiffe erblicken Ihn über den See hin (Mt. 14, 26) als zu Fuss herumgehend über dem See (Markus, Johannes), das ist, auf dem über dem See erhabenen Uferland (wie Joh. 21, 1)."

³ PAULUS, *op. cit.*, II, p. 248 . . . According to Paulus *ἐπὶ* is always over. That is to say, above the sea, i.e. as if standing on it. The *ἐπὶ* reminds us that Jesus could be seen: "weil er höher als die See erschien" (p. 260). Cf. *Philol.-exeget. Commentar*, IV, 1, p. 351. Jn. 6 : 19 means "gehend am See," cf. Jn. 21 : 1 . . . *ἐπὶ* with the genitive can in fact also be translated as "by" or "at," but here it means "on": John wishes to communicate a miracle. Cf. BAUER, *Das Johannes-evangelium*; BERNARD, *St. John*, who says: "If we had only Jn.'s account of this incident, we should have no reason to suppose that he intended to record any 'miracle'." Nor does John call it a "sign" as he does the other miracles. BARRETT, *St. John: the translation "by the sea" is possible, but: "It is highly improbable that this story was ever told otherwise than as a miracle story . . ."* GROSHIDE, *Johannes*. It is "on the sea."

⁴ F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 113. HUNTER, *The Work and Words of Jesus*, p. 58: ". . . it may be that instead of walking on the water Jesus was actually only wading in the surf, as St. John's account may well be taken to mean." TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, says that when the disciples approached the western shore "Jesus came upon them so suddenly that they thought his form was that of a ghost" (p. 123) . . . "It is not unreasonable to conclude that doctrinal and homiletical interests have left their mark upon a tradition which was confused from the beginning in the circumstances of a dark wild night at sea" (p. 124).

of Jesus on the shore." We might therefore say that they were the victims of an optical illusion.¹ KLAUSNER's explanation lies in the same plane. We are concerned here, he says, with a vision, a hallucination, such as we may expect from simple Oriental fishermen. The "spirit" was the product of their imagination. But the craving for miracles gradually led them to believe that they had really seen Jesus on the water and then had sailed in the boat with Him.² However, in that case they would have had both a visual and an aural hallucination! For the sake of its silliness we shall mention the view held by K. F. Barhdt. Jesus floated out to meet His disciples on a large beam which His disciples could not see, so that they thought a miracle was happening. This nonsense is served up to the reader as a "natural" explanation!³ More attention should be paid to the parapsychological approach. Parapsychology offers two possible explanations, viz. that of levitation and that of the astral phantom. In parapsychological literature reference is repeatedly made to the remarkable phenomenon of the reduction in weight of mediums in trance. Indeed, mediums are even said to float and to be lifted up.⁴ It is concluded from medieval literature on saints that levitation phenomena also occurred among them on several occasions, whilst Yogis are likewise considered capable of making themselves extremely light. It is said that the ascete Chatur Vapah, who lived in the seventeenth century, could walk on water: "without a drop splashing up."⁵ VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN does point to the possi-

¹ MACKINNON, *The Historic Jesus*, p. 365: "This is at least a possible explanation of the incident out of which the miracle developed, and those who have experienced the wonders of the mirage in a hot country will not be disposed to impugn offhand the explanation of an optical illusion."

² KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 269.

³ See SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 41.

⁴ Celebrated examples are Daniel Douglas Home, Eusapia Palladino and Rudi Schneider, to whom much attention is devoted in the literature of parapsychology. DIETZ, *Verschijsningen en Verschijsnelsen*. "Levitation, or rather auto-levitation, i.e. the rising or hovering of the medium, is merely a special form of telekinesis, viz. that in which the medium's power seizes upon his or her own body. It appears quite frequently in the tradition of various religions" (p. 111 f.). Cf. DRIESCH, *Parapsychologie*, p. 78 ff. VISSER, *Parapsychologie*, p. 159 ff. Visser considers levitation "one of the best proven phenomena of a parergical nature."

⁵ VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *Parapsychologie en Godsdienstig leven*, p. 90; DE JONG, *Das antike Mysterium-Wesen*, p. 296. OTTO, *Reich Gottes*, p. 299 ff., thinks that we must not envisage Yoga practices here. This is the phenomenon of the charismatic apparitio; the charismatic helps and consoles in need and danger. He appears: "halluzinativ sichtbar," although he himself is far away. "Also eine fantomartige apparitio ist vermutlich ursprünglich vermeint gewesen, die

bility of levitation with regard to Jesus, but personally he prefers the astral phantom explanation (in the phantom the astral body becomes visible), since in levitation one does not perform actions. Jesus helped the disciples in His astral apparition. "This possibility cannot be doubted," says VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN.¹ But in our opinion this possibility must be thoroughly doubted, since firstly it must be assumed for this hypothesis that Jesus was highly mediumistic and secondly this "explanation" must be preceded by belief in the astral phantom!

The allegorical interpretation of the account — whether it is offered with or without retention of the historical data — need not be discussed. It offers a refuge for all stories from the Gospels, but in general its effect is more edifying than illuminating.

If we consider the series of explanations, we can hardly say that a really satisfactory explanation is offered. Before we try to arrive at a conclusion, attention must first be paid to the important passage which occurs only in Matthew.

(d) *The Peter episode*

After Jesus had reassured His disciples, in Matthew's version Peter comes forward with the words: "Lord, if it be thou, bid me come unto thee on the water." This shows that Jesus' identification of Himself had met with hesitation and doubt on the part of Peter: if it is really you. . .²

Like his companions, Peter was seized with superstitious fear: might this be a phantasma, an apparition? This superstition is also spoken of in the Talmud.³

zu einem körperlichen Wandeln auf dem Wasser vergrößert wird" (p. 301).

¹ VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, op. cit., p. 90 f. TOLSMAN, *De Parapsychologie*, p. 95 ff., draws attention to the very great confusion prevailing with regard to the concepts astral body and double.

² κύριε, εἰ σὺ εἶ, κέλευσον με ἔλθεῖν πρὸς σὲ ἐπὶ τὰ ὕδατα, Mt. 14 : 28. In our opinion there is no reason why the particle εἰ, if, should not be interpreted in the conditional sense. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, translates: "Herr, wenn (denn) du es bist . . .," while KEULERS, *Mattheus*, says: "If it be thou" is not an expression of doubt, but means 'As it is thou,' etc." ALLEN, *St. Matthew*: "Lord, if it be Thou, bid me come to Thee over the waters."

³ Baba Bathra 73a: "Rabbah said: Seafarers told me: The wave that sinks a ship appears with a white fringe of fire at his crest, and when stricken with clubs on which is engraven, 'I am that I am' ¹), Yah, the Lord of Hosts, Amen, Amen, Selah," it subsides."

¹) Cf. Ex. III, 14. (transl. I. W. Slotki).

Megillah 3a: "But is the [Temple] service more important than the study of the Torah? Surely it is written, and it came to pass when Joshua was by Jericho,

In answer to Jesus' command: "Come," Peter left the boat and walked across the water to Jesus. But when he observed the wind, he became frightened and began to sink, whereupon he was saved by Jesus after crying out for help. The rationalistic explanation also offers a simple solution for this case. Peter made his way to Jesus: "perhaps in part swimming, as in Jn. 21 : 7, but for the greater part over the water, i.e. wading." By the shore there was a large wave caused by the surf, and it was through this wave that Jesus pulled the sinking Peter.¹

VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA approaches the Peter episode from another angle, viz. that of the history of religions. He is of the opinion that we must envisage Indian influences here and recalls the Jatakas, i.e. popular tales with morals to them. Now he believes that he has found a parallel to Matthew 14 : 28-33 in one of these tales.² He says: "It appears not impossible to us that the Peter

that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and behold there stood a man over against him . . . and he fell on his face. ¹) Now how could he do such a thing, seeing that R. Joshua b. Levi has said that it is forbidden to a man to greet another by night, for fear that he is a demon?"

¹) Josh. V, 13 f. (transl. M. Simon) . . .

The disciples thus believed that they were concerned with a water-spirit (*phantasma*, *strix*, *lamia*, *nocturnus lemur*). The souls of the dead could appear, cf. CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 152: "Man glaubt, Verstorbene im schlafenden oder wachen Zustande sehen zu können . . . So auch noch die Jünger Mk. 6, 49; Mt. 14, 26; Luc. 24, 37, wenn da unter *φάντασμα* oder *πνεῦμα* der Geist eines Verstorbenen zu verstehen ist."

¹ PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, II, p. 243. Cf. F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*. It is possible that Peter tried to swim towards Jesus, cf. Jn. 21 : 7 (p. 140). STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, attacks Paulus fiercely on this point. Think of the distances: had Peter to swim 30 furlongs? The theory put forward by some that both Jesus and Peter can be regarded as having swum or waded through shallows is likewise untenable (p. 183 ff.).

² VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA, *Indische invloeden op oude christelijke verhalen*, p. 60 ff. The *Silānisainsa-Jātaka* contains the following account: "a believing layman . . . a faithful, pious, an elect disciple—came to the bank of the river Aciravati; as no boat could be seen at the landingstage, and our friend's mind being full of delightful thoughts of the Buddha, he walked into the river. His feet did not sink below the water. He got as far as midriver walking as though he were on dry land; but there he noticed the waves. Then his ecstasy subsided, and his feet began to sink. Again he strung himself up to high tension, and walked on over the water. So he arrived at Jetavana." Cf. AUFHAUSER, *Buddha and Jesus*. The story is in the introduction to *Jātaka* 190 . . . When the "master" asked if he had had a good journey, the layman told of his experiences, whereupon the master replied: "Nicht nur jetzt, o Laienbruder, hast du, da du dich an die Buddhavorzüge erinnerst, einen festen Untergrund erlangt, sondern auch früher schon fanden Laienbrüder inmitten des Ozeans, als ihr Schiff zertrümmert war, einen festen Untergrund, da sie der Buddhavorzüge gedachten" (p. 12).

anecdote under discussion is derived — although indirectly — from an Indian sphere of thought.”¹ However, a close comparison of the texts will reveal only a few points of similarity, viz. the fear of sinking and the attention paid to the waves. But the differences are strikingly great: the Indian story does not mention a boat; Peter was not in ecstasy; he took only a few steps on the water; he did not re-enter a state of ecstasy when he began to sink. Quite apart from all kinds of literary and historical problems, it therefore seems anything but likely to us that there could be any question here of derivation or influence. DIBELIUS, who likewise draws attention to this story and to another parallel,² also points to the Odes of Solomon, which speak of the journey of a believer over the waters of death.³ Jesus is said to be the mythical hero and Peter the mystes who imitates Him. “Of course, these are simply possibilities,” DIBELIUS adds (most wisely!).⁴ A reference to a text in the Proverbs of Jesus Sirach,

¹ VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA, *op. cit.*, p. 64. Van den Bergh van Eysinga points out that in the first centuries A.D. trade between India and Asia Minor assumed considerable proportions, and says: “most probably Indian tradition already made its effect felt on the old Christian Gospel account” (p. 134). Cf. also Proposition I: “It must be acknowledged that in some old Christian stories an Indian influence is perceptible.”

² DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*. “Man könnte diesen buddhistischen Jünger, der in der Versenkung den Fluss Aciravatī überschreitet, darum für das Urbild des christlichen halten, weil dieses Wunder für die wunderwirkende Kraft der Versenkung besonders bezeichnend ist, während die Petrus-Legende keinen Grund für die Bitte des Petrus an den Meister nennt. Freilich sind auch Beziehungen zum Christus-Mythus möglich und damit eine autochthone Entstehung der Legende aus christlichen Gedanken” (p. 113). Dibelius therefore really leaves the matter open. Elsewhere he also recalls an account in the “*Apophthegmata Patrum*” (a tradition preserved in Greek, consisting of 1500-2000 items, containing pronouncements and vicissitudes, probably of Coptic anchorites. They are believed to date from the second half of the fourth and the first half of the fifth century after Christ. Cf. p. 172 ff.). In the *Apophthegmata* in which a certain Bisarion is mentioned (*Apophthegmata Bisarion* 2): “wird erzählt, wie der Abbas unter Gebet einen Fluss überschreitet und dabei nur bis zum Knöchel im Wasser einsinkt” (p. 176, note 2).

³ Cf. HENNECKE, *op. cit.*, p. 469 . . . Ode 39 speaks of the “waters of death,” which separate “Jenseits” and “Diesseits” from each other. The waters are tremendous and dangerous. “Doch wer sie im Glauben überschreitet, entsetzt sich nicht; wer ohne Fehl über sie wandelt, erzittert nicht” (v. 5). “Der Herr überbrückte sie durch sein Wort, er betrat und überschritt sie zu Fuss. Seine Fusstapfen stehen im Wasser unzerstört und sind wie ein fest eingerammtes Holz” (vv. 9 and 10). “So ist der Weg denen bereitet, die ihm nach hinübergehen, die den Spuren seines Glaubens folgen und seinen Namen verehren. Hallelujah” (v. 13) (transl. H. Gressmann).

⁴ DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*. Dibelius calls Mk. 6 : 45-51 a: “Beispiel für die Überfremdung einer christlichen Erzählung durch nichtchristliche Motive.”

which we encounter in VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA, is equally pointless.¹

(e) *Conclusions*

The numerous problems mentioned above, to which a number of others could be added, do not make it easy to draw conclusions. From the point of view of literary and historical criticism insuperable difficulties continue to exist, which no harmonistics can expunge. Why is the Peter episode related only by Matthew and not by Mark, whose special relation to Peter is after all undeniable?² Why does John's version differ so much from those of the two Synoptists? Why do the accounts end so differently? These are all questions which can be answered in different ways.

As regards the "appeal" to the analogous stories from miracle literature so as to banish the walking of Jesus on the Sea of Galilee to the bottomless pit of legend, or to ascribe it to derivation, we should like to point out that there is absolutely no conclusive evidence for this. This is simply because, as we have said elsewhere, stories like this cannot help coming into being when the miracle-worker is credited with power over the elements. Finding related aspects is not the same as finding interdependence or literary influence. The latter point is unfortunately too often forgotten by many a scholar.³

As was the case in the healing miracles, it will be necessary here to fall back on the Old Testament. This does not mean that a number of texts should be collected from the Old Testament as "references."

This account: "könnte man nun wieder auf die mythischen Wasser des Todes gedeutet haben; und darum hätte man dann auch den Jünger Petrus auf dem Wasser schreiten lassen (Mt. 14, 24-33); Jesus der mythische Held, Petrus der Myste, der es ihm nachtut. Natürlich handelt es sich hier nur um Möglichkeiten; dass solche Möglichkeiten aber den Christen nahe liegen, zeigt die 39. Ode Salomos . . ." (p. 277 f.).

¹ VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA, *Verklaring van het Evangelie naar Mattheüs*, p. 137. Van den Bergh van Eysinga recalls Jesus Sirach 24 : 5b: "Wisdom walks across the waves of the sea." It is a mystery to us how a connection can be established between these words and the Peter episode . . . KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*, points to: "Ginza Rechter Teil II, 1, 140, S. 49, 8 ff. Ferner erscheint Christus, der Verführer, in einer anderen Gestalt. Er tritt vor euch und spricht zu euch: Ich gehe über das Wasser hin. Kommet mit mir, ihr werdet nicht ertrinken" . . . Some scholars suggest that this was originally an event after Jesus' resurrection.

² It is remarkable that Matthew also refers elsewhere to Peter whilst Mark does not mention him, see Mt. 15 : 15; 16 : 17-19; 17 : 24-27; 18 : 21 . . . See CULLMANN, *Peter*, p. 23 ff.

³ See the chapter: Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels.

This was the technique already used by TERTULLIAN to combat the heretic Marcion. Jesus' walking on the water had been prophesied: "For if he crosses, a psalm is fulfilled. 'The Lord,' it is said, '[is] upon many waters'."¹ What one sees as a fulfilled prophecy, i.e. as "proof" that it is genuine, another, for instance STRAUSS, regards as "proof" that it is false and concludes from it that mythical fabrication has been at work! No, by falling back on the Old Testament we mean noting and understanding the Message of the Old Testament. Yahweh is the Creator of seas and rivers; He guides them and subdues them, He is their Lord! This is proclaimed and represented to the people of Israel again and again; it plays a central role in the proclamation of the Old Testament in illustrating Yahweh's majesty. Jesus' wonderful appearance on the Sea of Galilee must be read and "understood" in the light of, or rather starting from, the absolute and mighty nature of this proclamation. Understood as a reality and as a sign that the living God "has come" in the revelation of the Son. For only in that way can and may the account be believed, despite the editorial irregularities and all the other difficulties.

We have already pointed out that Jesus in His "epiphany" did not simply wish to pass His disciples in a display of power. His revelation of might was really a revelation of salvation! On the strength of this view — which we believe to be founded in the accounts given in the Gospels — we believe that we must also adopt a critical attitude to the idea developed by BARTH. In a broad argument he has, in his discussion of the Creation, laid a path which, for an understanding of Jesus' walking on the Sea of Galilee, we can retrace right to the Creation! For BARTH considers it of far-reaching importance that in Gen. 1 : 6-8 the usual addition: "and God saw that it was good" is not present. Why? He investigates in detail what the Old Testament says about the force of water. Again and again it becomes evident that God sets a "limit" to water; think of the passages of the Red Sea and the Jordan. BARTH deduces from this that in Israelitic thought water represents the forces of evil which are opposed to the salvation intended for Israel.² It is "definitely not a coincidence" that Israel

¹ TERTULLIAN, *Adv. Marc.*, IV, 20: "Nam cum transfretat, psalmus expungitur. Dominus, inquit, super aquas multas."

² BARTH, K. D., III, 1: "Die Vermutung ist nicht abzuweisen, dass bei der Darstellung dieser Anschauung und also bei der Durchführung dieser Gleichung die dem ganzen alten Orient bekannte Vorstellung eines Kampfes der Gottheit gegen das besonders im Meer repräsentierte Chaosungeheuer Gebrauch gemacht wurde" (p. 164). Cf. REYMOND, *op. cit.*, Chapitre V, La Mer, pp. 163-196. Even

was "not a seafaring nation," says BARTH, see Ps. 107 : 23 ff. In view of all these data, BARTH considers the attitude of Jesus with regard to the water "all the more remarkable."¹

BARTH's synthetic view charms us at first, but upon closer consideration it proves to be disputable and confusing. The floods created by God, though subject to Him, are from the beginning "beside" Him and "opposed to" Him. "The water participates in the whole violence of the human world and human power, which are inimical to Israel and thus opposed to the cause and the honour of its God, despite the fact that they are governed, ruled and used by this God."² This statement is confusing and dangerous. In

if God reigns over waters and seas: "une menace subsiste." In the sea the last enemies of Yahweh conceal themselves. "Ainsi donc, L'Ancien Testament, comme le Nouveau, du reste, sait que tant que la mer subsiste, le monde n'est pas totalement en sécurité et l'idée que les eaux sont hostiles jusqu'à la fin du monde n'a pu quitter totalement les auteurs bibliques" (p. 195).

¹ "Um so bemerkenswerter ist es dann, dass die greifbarsten messianischen Machttaten Jesu darin bestehen, dass er in königlicher Freiheit auf dem Meer wandelt und dass er dem Sturm und seinen Wellen durch sein Wort Einhalt gebietet." The account in Ac. 27-28 also indicates that: "auch noch der neutestamentliche Schriftsteller das Zeichen des Meeres kennt," and that he: "schliesslich im Zusammenhang mit den Seewundern Jesu selbst die Erfüllung aller alttestamentlichen Weissagung von Gottes Herrschaft über das gefährliche Meer und so auch die Bewährung von Gen. 1, 9-10 gesehen hat" (III, 1, p. 166). Such a manner of exegesis goes too far for us; it tries to summarize and consider too much at once. A reference to Rev. 21 : 1 (there was no more sea) does not help to elucidate this either. But the LXX does add to Gen. 1 : 8: "and God saw that it was good."

² BARTH, K.D., III, I, p. 166. Compare with Barth's view that held by KAISER, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel*. At the Creation the world of men was surrounded on all sides by water, but God gave man room in which to live. There was no question then of the water helping or hindering. "Es erscheint als ein Gott unterworfenen Material, das freilich, wie uns die Sintfluterzählung zeigt, für den Menschen etwas Unheimliches behält" (p. 117). For the author of the Book of Job Leviathan was a creature of God just as much as for the author of Psalm 104. "Eine wirklich urzeitlich gegen- und nebengöttliche Macht hätte sich mit seiner Gottesvorstellung nicht mehr vertragen" (p. 151). No trace can be found of an "eigentlich göttlichen Potenz des Wassers" (p. 153 ff.). MENOUD, *La Signification du Miracle dans le Nouveau Testament*, p. 181, says of the miracles on the Sea of Galilee: "Les récits de la tempête apaisée et de la marche sur les eaux révèlent aussi la souveraineté de Jésus sur la nature. Ici aussi les récits ne comportent aucun élément ostentatoire ou servant à glorifier le thaumaturge. Ils ne sont que des signes annonçant que l'hostilité de la nature contre l'homme doit cesser avec l'avènement du monde nouveau." MÁNEK, *Fishers of Men*, says, in accordance with his view that the waters are the place of sin and death, that Jesus' walking on the Sea means in the first place that: "Jesus is always above the water, because He is 'without sin' (Hebrews IV 15)" (p. 140).

this way the water is so to speak granted an independent existence, it is personified, in fact demonized. Ornate figures of speech from the Old Testament are transformed into realities. How are we to understand the concept of forces of evil in relation to Ex. 14 : 22, 28 and 29? And what is BARTH trying to say? Does he mean that Jesus, by subduing the storm and walking on the Sea of Galilee, triumphed as Victor over actual forces of evil, spending their rage in the Sea, which have now been conquered and destroyed for good by Jesus' revelation of power? Or does he mean that Jesus smashed the whole of Israel's idea about water being inimical to God? Or does he mean something else? Whatever he may mean, we believe that the data in the Old Testament do not allow of such inimical independence being attributed to the water, and the theological link between Gen. 1 : 6-8 and Jesus' walking on the Sea of Galilee is invisible to us.

We should like to draw attention to two further details in the accounts. Firstly, Jesus' words "Be of good cheer; it is I; be not afraid."¹ Jesus' intention in speaking these words was not only to allay the disciples' fear, but also to correct their delusion. Jesus emphatically said: "It is I." The emphatic "I" spoken by Jesus occurs repeatedly in the Gospels, and Jesus always means it to refer to the entirely individual nature of His person and His actions, to His authority, His task, His promises.² This also applies in this

¹ For *θαράσσω* see the chapter: Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels.

² See STAUFFER, TWNT, II, pp. 345-348, on the meaning of *ἐγώ* in Jesus. "Im Munde des synoptischen Jesus ist das emphatische *ἐγώ* noch verhältnismässig selten. Es begegnet etwa in feierlichen Drohungen, Verheissungen oder Befehlsworten, die Jesus im Bewusstsein seiner göttlichen Macht und Autorität ausspricht." In the Gospel of John "ego" receives the full stress; here it is: "ein charakteristisches Stilelement der Offenbarungsreden des Gottessohnes, die nun den Hauptbestand der Verkündigung Jesu ausmachen." ALBERTZ, op. cit., I, 1, p. 106: "In allen Offenbarungsreligionen, insbesondere in der biblischen Botschaft, ist die Selbstoffenbarungsformel: Ich Bin, verbunden mit einer Theophanieerzählung, die grundlegende Verkündigung." Cf. II, 1, pp. 183-188, on "Das Ich des Christus." The Law has become concrete in Jesus and is concentrated in Him. "Es ist also an die Stelle der Thora das Ich Jesu Christi getreten" (p. 185). Cf. DE GROOT-HULST, Macht en Wil, p. 10, on the 'I' sentences in the Old Testament. DODD, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, pp. 93-96 and 345: *ἐγώ εἰμι* is "the equivalent of the divine name *אני הוה*, I am." STAUFFER, Jesus Gestalt u. Geschichte, p. 130 ff. BARTH, K.D., IV, 3, p. 206: "Das synoptische 'Das Reich Gottes ist nahe herbeigekommen'—sächlich identisch mit dem johanneischen 'Ich bin es' (*ἐγώ εἰμι*)—ist die Summe und der Inbegriff seiner prophetischen Botschaft und so der von ihm vermittelten Erkenntnis." SCHNACKENBURG, Neutestam. Theologie, p. 113 f.

case: the "it is I," as immediate identification, must remove the fear.

In the second place further attention should be paid to the statement in the Peter episode that Jesus stretched forth His hand to the sinking disciple and grasped him. FUCHS has some interesting and shrewd things to say about the form in which the account is cast. He believes that the "stretching forth of the hand" brings to the fore a "theatrical moment" from a more extensive action, making the story more vivid. This "stretching forth" must always be followed by something, e.g. a gift or a prayer.¹ FUCHS then divides the Peter episode into seven scenes (words and actions), the seventh of which (Jesus and Peter climb into the boat and the wind drops) is concluded with the worship: "Of a truth thou art the Son of God." This description, says FUCHS, is clearly of the event as seen from the boat.²

From the stylistic point of view this would form the solution for the conclusion of the account in Matthew, viz. the positive attitude of the disciples. We believe that this attitude can also be considered quite explicable from the historical and psychological point of view: what happens to Peter causes the fear to change into worship.

Jesus' appearance on the Sea of Galilee must not merely be interpreted as a salutary, saving revelation of power vis-à-vis the disciples, but also as a sign of divine, saving nearness for everyone who believes and, in his belief, obeys.³ BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL

¹ FUCHS, TWNT, II, p. 458: "Zusammenfassend lässt sich sagen, dass ἐκτείνειν τὰς χεῖρας ein szenisches Moment aus einem umfassenderen Handeln heraushebt, mithin wesentlich der Vergegenwärtigung der Erzählung dient. Auf das ἐκτείνειν τὰς χεῖρας muss immer etwas folgen, etwa eine Gabe (Sir 4, 31) oder ein Gebet (I 'Εσδρ 8, 70; 4 Makk 4, 11). Insofern wird mit dem ἐκτείνειν τὰς χεῖρας oft der Entschluss zu einer Tat ausgedrückt. Damit ist die Brücke zu dem nt.lichen Sprachgebrauch gegeben, soweit dieser in der Wendung ἐκτείνειν τὰς χεῖρας Besonderheiten enthalten mag."

² FUCHS, op. cit., p. 459: "Die Darstellung des Mt ist deutlich vom Schiff aus gegeben; dem entspricht dann sein Schluss v. 33. Von da aus wird der 'Griff' Jesu verständlich: hätte man den Petrus ins Boot gezogen, so wäre dieselbe Wendung gebraucht worden. Dann liegt aber das Besondere gerade nicht im Griff Jesu als solchem, sondern in der Tatsache, dass er überhaupt zugreift: *das* sollen wir miterleben." Fuchs sees in this an illustration of his theory about the "stretching forth of the hands," viz. "wenn Jesu Willen auf mich gerichtet ist, bin ich auch schon von ihm ergriffen."

³ BARTH points to the interaction of faith and obedience. "Auch Petrus auf dem See (Matth. 14, 29) würde nicht glauben, wenn er Jesu Ruf: 'Komm!' nicht gehorchen, das Schiff nicht verlassen und über das Wasser auf ihn zugehen würde" (K.D., IV, 2, p. 608; see also II, 2, p. 496). HELD, Mt. als Interpret der Wundergesch. (Überlief. u. Ausleg. im Mt.-Ev., p. 259 f.), is of the opinion that Peter's walking on the water has not only ecclesiological significance (Nachfolgemotiv),

has put this into the following striking words: "The reality of the concealed majesty, which here gleamed faintly, long before Passover, in the grey morning on the lake, is the great, the valuable possession for the generation of martyrs; it is of the effort required to be able to understand this, to dare to understand it, that Mark speaks in this part of his proclamation."¹

but also a Christological purpose. Christ is the Saviour of His disciples, but at the same time He lets them share in His power: Peter is allowed to walk on the waves.

¹ BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, *Markus* . . . At quite an early date the event of the Sea of Galilee was interpreted as a "sign" of Christ's aid. See *Acta Thom.*, 66: "Und wenn ihr auf dem Meere fahrt und in Gefahr seid und niemand helfen kann, wandelt er auf den Wassern und richtet durch seine Hilfe (euer Schiff) auf" (HENNECKE, op. cit., p. 273). See also *Acta Petri* (*Actus Vercellenses*), 7, where Peter says in an address: "Und er wandelte über die Wasser, wofür ich selbst Zeuge bleibe (und auch dafür), dass er damals in der Welt durch Zeichen und Wunder, die er alle getan hat, gewirkt habe" (HENNECKE, p. 236). *Christ. Sibyll.*, VIII, 273, 274: "Die Winde wird er mit dem Worte stillen, glätten das Meer, wenn es rast, indem er es mit den Füßen des Friedens und im Glauben betritt." VI, 13: "Die Wellen wird er betreten, Krankheit von den Menschen nehmen . . ." (HENNECKE, pp. 408 and 412). The way in which the event was later magnified and exaggerated is shown by ARNOBIUS, *Adv. Gentes*, I, 46: "Was he one of us . . . at whose word only the raging and maddened seas were still, the whirlwinds and tempests were lulled, who walked over the deepest pools with unwet foot; who trod the ridges of the deep, the very waves being astonished, and nature coming under bondage?" (transl. Archibald Hamilton Bryce).

XVII. THE MIRACULOUS CATCHES OF FISH

Twice reference is made to a startling catch of fish, in Lk. 5 : 1-11 and in Jn. 21 : 1-14. In both accounts the person of Peter is the central figure.

(a) *Luke's account*

When Lk. 5 : 1-11 is compared with Mt. 4 : 18-22 and Mk. 1 : 16-20, which also speak of Peter's call, a number of questions arise. For Matthew and Mark say nothing at all about a catch. Are there two different accounts of the call, one by Matthew and Mark and one by Luke? But in that case the first call would have to be regarded as provisional, or perhaps unfaithfulness among the disciples would have to be supposed.¹ However, there is no objection to envisaging one call handed down in different traditions. Luke found in some source or the other the story of the catch of fish, in which the figure of Peter comes to the fore and in which he already occupies a certain position. KEULERS relates this to Luke's literary technique; he says that Luke "here again links up several facts, as he does with regard to Jesus' visit to Nazareth. To tell an 'orderly' tale he runs together a number of episodes relating to the lake of Genesareth."² Some have wondered whether the accounts by Luke and John must be reduced to one source. Are the roots of John's story to be found in Luke's, or is perhaps the converse true? However, the difference between the two accounts is too striking for them to relate to one event.

Luke begins with a vivid description of the situation, verses 1-3. Jesus was standing by the lake of Gennesaret, and the people were crowding around Him. He saw two boats by the shore. The fishermen were washing their nets; they had finished their night's work. Jesus took the initiative; He went on board Simon Peter's boat and asked him to go out on to the lake, not far from the shore. Jesus then taught the people from the boat. This is indicative of the short distance between boat and shore, cf. Mk. 4 : 1. Verse 4 ushers in the transition

¹ KEULERS, Marcus en Lucas... BULTMANN, Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 232, classifies the account among the "Wundergeschichten"... GILS, Jésus Prophète, perceives in Lk. 5 : 1-11 Jesus' action as a prophet (p. 125). "... la pêche miraculeuse symbolisait le rôle futur de Pierre" (p. 161 f.).

² KEULERS, op. cit., Cf. KLOSTERMANN, Das Lukasevangelium.

to a new phase: the teaching of the multitude is followed by an appeal to a few. Jesus commanded Peter to sail further out on the lake and to let down his nets for fishing. Luke uses the general word for "net," while Matthew and Mark specify the kind of net.¹ Then follows the description of the catch itself, verses 5-7. Peter obeyed Jesus' command, although he and his companions had toiled in vain throughout the night — the most favourable time for fishing. Jesus' words formed the motive for the new attempt. The result was surprising: they caught a "great multitude of fishes."² The nets even broke.³ Peter and Andrew could not manage alone, and beckoned — this implies a greater distance — to James and John to come and help. These brothers were their partners.⁴ The catch was brought aboard: "and filled both the ships, so that they began to sink." In the following scene, verses 8-10, Peter is the central figure. Falling on his knees before Jesus he said: "Depart from me; for I am a sinful man, O Lord." Peter certainly did not mean by this that Jesus had to leave his boat, nor that he himself, as an evildoer, might bring misfortune, an old sailors' superstition; he voiced his emotions, "overwhelmed by Jesus' greatness."⁵ Peter knew himself to be sinful, guilty. It cannot be said for sure what this sinfulness consisted in. Did Peter mean by "a sinful man" his sinfulness in general? Did he have a concrete case in mind, or was he thinking of his occupation, which many regarded as dishonourable?⁶

¹ δίκτυον, Lk. 5 : 2, 4, 5, 6, is used for fishing in the deep sea . . . ἀμφιβληστρον, Mt. 4 : 18, Mk. 1 : 16 (from ἀμφιβάλλω, throwing around), a round casting net with a diameter of some 10 to 15 feet. The outer edge is weighted, so that as the net sinks rapidly it imprisons the fish under it. In the middle of the net is a rope by means of which it can be pulled up. Mt. 13 : 47 mentions a drag net, σαγγήνη. See among others DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 144 f.; GALLING, *Bibl. Reallexicon*, col. 168; BISHOP, *Jesus of Palestine*, p. 63 ff. BODENHEIMER, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands*, p. 200: "Drag-nets (Isa. 19, 8; Matt. 13, 47 ff.) and casting-nets (Matt. 4, 18; John 21) were and are used. Also fishing with hook and line (Isa. 19, 8; Matt. 17, 27) and fish spearing (Job 12, 7) were known."

² For the Sea of Galilee, see FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *De bello Jud.*, III, X, 7. Flavius Josephus states that various kinds of fish are found there which are not encountered elsewhere. See DALMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 143 f., for the various kinds.

³ The net "brake" (διαρρήγνυμι) or was about to break. GREYDANUS, *Lukas*, envisages "the sharp sound caused by the breaking of one rope after the other, now here, now there." Hence the imperfect.

⁴ KEULERS, *op. cit.* See HANSE, *TWNT*, II, p. 831: μέτοχος here means: "Gefährte, Kollege." Cf. HAUCK, *Lukas*.

⁵ SCHNEIDER, *TWNT*, II, p. 677. Cf. KEULERS, *op. cit.* . . . KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium: for the sailors' superstition cf. Jonah 1 : 15; Cicero, De nat. deor.*, III, 37, 39; Horace, *Carmina*, III, 2, 26.

⁶ Cf. RENGSTORF, *TWNT*, I, p. 331 ff. HAUCK, *Lukas*: the Greeks despised

Luke points out how "astonished" both Peter and his partners were at the extremely large catch.¹

Then the calling of Peter follows: "Fear not; from henceforth thou shalt catch men," verse 10. In Mt. 4 : 19 and Mk. 1 : 17 it is stated that Jesus' call applied to the four men present, whilst it follows from Lk. 5 : 11 that not only Peter but also the others answered the call.

Now how must this remarkable event be interpreted? As a miracle in the strict sense of the word or as a *mirabile*? Of course one can join FIEBIG in saying that such things are impossible.² Or one can share BULTMANN's opinion that Lk. 5 : 1-11 is the development of a few words by Jesus on "fishers of men" and that John 21 : 1-14 forms a variant of this.³

CLEMEN draws attention to a story which he found in Lehmann. On a certain island there lived an old man, Rinambesi: "who by his words 'go, you will catch a multitude of fish' encouraged the catching of fish. When these words brought success, the saying was 'Rinambesi mana;' when they did not, it was 'Rinambesi lied or made a mistake.' This is in essence a very good parallel to Luke's interpretation of the words to Peter: 'Launch out into the deep, and let down your nets for a draught,' and Peter's reply: 'at thy word I will let down the net.' He is successful, which Luke probably interprets simply as the effect of Jesus' words."⁴

skippers and publicans. "So ist die Erzählung für hellenistische Leser Ausdruck des Ev, dass Jesus die Sünder annimmt." According to ORIGEN, c. Celsum, I, 62, Celsus said: "that Jesus allied to himself ten or eleven certain notorious men, of the worst publicans and skippers . . ." Cf. I, 63; II, 46. In BARNABAS, V, 9, the apostles are called "men sinful above all sins," chosen by Jesus to prove that He had come to save sinners. DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, p. 110: "Ein 'Sünder' im Sinn der pharisäischen Frömmigkeit ist der galiläische Fischer, auch ohne dass er sich einer schweren Verfehlung schuldig weiss."

¹ For the astonishment, θαύματος, see the chapter: Type and Style of the Miracle Stories in the Gospels.

² FIEBIG, *Jüd. Wundergeschichten*, p. 95: "Derartiger Einfluss Jesu auf die Fische ist natürlich ebenso unmöglich wie etwa die Geschichte Mt 17, 24 ff. oder die Geschichte von der Perle im Fisch."

³ BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 246: "Für wahrscheinlich halte ich, dass die Geschichte vom wunderbaren Fischzug Lk 5, 1-11 in Jesu Wort von den 'Menschenfischern' ihre eine Wurzel hat (s. S. 232), wie dieses Wort ja auch zur Bildung der Berufungsgeschichten Mk 1, 16-20 geführt haben dürfte (s. S. 26 f.)." Compare the same author's *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 545: "Die Geschichte vom wunderbaren Fischzug, den die Quelle bot, ist, wie längst erkannt, eine Variante von Lk 5, 1-11."

⁴ CLEMEN, *Die Reste der primitiven Religion*, p. 20, note 4, referring to R. F. Lehmann, *Mana*, p. 44 . . . BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 232, re Lk. 5 : 1-11: "Ob dabei ein Märchenmotiv eingewirkt hat, mag zweifelhaft bleiben."

The resemblance between Jesus and Rinambesi is so slight that no further attention need be paid to this "parallel."

The question is the following. How did this great multitude of fish come to the spot where Peter cast the net? The supposition that Jesus created them there at that moment seems highly improbable. PLUMMER thinks that this was not a miracle of creation, but an example of Jesus' knowledge.¹ We find approximately the same view in F. BARTH: Jesus does not hunt the fish into the net, but shows where they are to be found, with an "inexplicable distant gaze."² CALVIN says that, although much is often caught with one good cast, we must nevertheless think of God's dispensation here.³ GREYDANUS is of the same sentiments. Jesus had not just seen the fish and pointed them out to Peter, but had assigned them, i.e. ordained them into Peter's nets by His power.⁴ KEULERS concludes from the reaction of Peter, who as an experienced fisherman knew "what was natural in this respect and what was not," that this is a "miracle," without going into details.⁵

MANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, communicates Gressmann's statement: "dass man aus altbabylonischen Darstellungen einen wunderbaren Fischzug des Gilgamesch erschliessen zu können glaubt: Herzog et Thureau-Dangin, *Nouvelles Fouilles de Tello* 1910, p. 32 ff." BIELER, *op. cit.*, p. 105, recalls two accounts of Pythagoras, Porph. 25 and Iambl. 36. Both accounts are to the same effect. Pythagoras states the number of fish. But BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 545, says that there are no analogies here.

¹ PLUMMER, *St. Luke*: "Not a miracle of creation, but at least of knowledge, even if Christ's will did not bring the fish to the spot."

² FR. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 140.

³ CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Lk. 5:1: "Quamvis enim usitatum sit piscatoribus multos facere iactus steriles, uno deinde prospero iactu pensare quicquid laboris frustra sumpserant: miraculum tamen ex hac circumstantia enituit, quod quum tota nocte nihil cepissent (quae tamen ad capturam aptior est) subito in eorum retia ingens copia piscium, quae naves impleat, coacervatur."

⁴ GREYDANUS, *Lukas*. "It was not a matter of the Lord's gaze, or of His great knowledge, but of His power of disposition." Jesus also ruled over the fish of the sea, cf. Gen. 1:21 and 28... BARTH, in the chapter "Schöpfung und Bund," K.D., III, 1, draws attention to among other things birds and fish. In his opinion one of the differences between the Old Testament and the New Testament is that in the New Testament the fish becomes: "ein interessantes Wesen." In the New Testament the fish appears alongside bread: "als so etwas wie *die* Speise des Menschen." This is precisely why fishing is the occupation from which the disciples are called to Jesus: "und darum gerade der wunderbar reiche Fischfang (Luk. 5, 4 f., Joh. 21, 1 f.) als Inbegriff der messianischen Segnung des Menschen und zugleich als die Darstellung der Entstehung der Kirche" (p. 196). We wonder whether fish, fishing and eating fish may be theologically combined in this way!

⁵ KEULERS, *op. cit.*

To understand this event, attention should be paid to the situation as a whole, and to its purport. The fishermen had toiled all night long in vain. Jesus had taught the people from Peter's boat, which doubtless did not fail also to have its effect on Peter. Immediately after His speech Jesus commanded Peter to push off for deep water. Peter did this: "at thy word," i.e. at the word of Him who had just spoken with authority. Peter's reaction, described in verse 8, may therefore be seen as the consequence of everything that had happened. Luke doubtless stresses the marvellous nature of the great catch — the boats were filled "so that they began to sink" — and hence the possibility remains open that Jesus had noticed the huge shoal of fish by virtue of His special knowledge. However, the possibility that Jesus had perceived the presence of the fish in natural fashion, whilst this had escaped the notice of the fishermen, may not be at once rejected as "rationalistic."¹ The view that the fish were driven into the nets by Jesus' will seems to us to be an undesirable aggravation. We therefore do not regard this surprisingly large catch of fish as a miraculum but as a mirabile, which immediately gave way to the sign, the call and the prophecy which Jesus attached to it.

Various allegorical explanations, in which for instance the boat, the net and the sea are said to depict the Church, the faith and the pagan world respectively, though ingeniously thought out, have no foundation in the account itself.²

(b) *John's account*

The account of Jesus' appearance by the Sea of Galilee after His resurrection, which contains the second story of a miraculous

¹ GODET, Lukas, I, p. 287, quotes from Tristram, *The Natural History of the Bible*, p. 285, who says that the denseness of the schools of fish in Lake Gennesaret is almost unbelievable for those who have not seen them. He adds that they often cover an acre and even more of the surface, and if the fish slowly arrive en masse and jump up out of the water, they are so tightly pressed together that it seems as if a heavy downpour of rain is falling on the surface of the water.

² Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium*, who rejects the allegorization of H. Holtzmann, Loisy, etc. . . . Augustine had already linked up the breaking of the net with heresies . . . MÁNEK, *Fishers of Men*, thinks that in the background of Jesus' invitation there are "old cosmogonical myths, in which the water is seen as an enemy of God . . . The waters are the underworld, the place of sin and death. To fish out a man means to rescue him from the kingdom of darkness, out of the sphere, which is hostile to God and remote from God" (p. 138 f.). The laboured nature of this exegesis is immediately evident. For a fish that has been caught dies on dry land; a man who has been "caught," on the other hand, comes to "life!" The point is in the concept "catch," not in the trimmings.

catch of fish, Jn. 21 : 1-14, has given rise to a series of questions which may be left unconsidered here. The Evangelist states that Jesus "on this wise shewed" Himself, and then describes the disciples' situation. At the suggestion of Simon Peter — again the leading figure — the disciples had gone fishing, but their night's work was not rewarded, verses 1-3; cf. Lk. 5 : 5. When day dawned Jesus stood on the shore, but the disciples did not recognize Him. The fishermen answered Jesus' question: "Children,¹ have ye any meat?" with a brief "No."² The following words: "Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find," announce the revelation. It is improbable that the right side here is an allusion to the "lucky side." Psychologically speaking, it is quite understandable that the men complied with Jesus' command: perhaps they still had a chance!³

The catch was enormous, and the disciple "whom Jesus loved" recognized the stranger. "It is the Lord." This statement was addressed to Simon Peter, and scarcely had he heard this when he wrapped his coat around himself, "for he was naked," threw himself into the lake and swam towards the land — nothing is said about his walking on the water.⁴ The other disciples covered the distance

¹ *παῖδια*, Jn. 21 : 5. OEPKE, TWNT, V, p. 637: the word is meant figuratively: "Als liebevolle Anrede des geistlichen Vaters an die ihm Befohlenen: des Auferstandenen an seine Jünger J 21, 5." KEULERS, Joannes: "As Jesus for the time being poses as a stranger, *παῖδια* seems to mean nothing more than "young men;" "it has a kind ring to it, but in no way betrays who the speaker is."

² Meat, *προσφάγιον*. The main item on the Jewish menu was bread. Meat, fish, eggs, vegetables, etc., formed the side-dishes; see STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 586; IV, 2, p. 611 ff.

³ BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 543, asks: "Ist es verständlich, dass sie den Befehl eines fremden Mannes V. 6 ohne weiteres ausführen?" He refers to Peter's hesitation, Lk. 5 : 5, whilst on that occasion Jesus was not an unknown person. But the situation is different. In Jn. 21 the men are still fishing, whilst in Lk. 5 it is recounted that Peter has to go further out into the lake. Moreover, Peter knew that the fish always tend to gather by the shore of the lake. DE VISSER, *Israëls ambten en bedrijven in Jezus' dagen*, remarks: "Jesus was therefore asking almost the impossible of Peter as a fisherman when he told him to put off from the shore," p. 106.

⁴ Peter was not entirely naked; even the barbarians regarded this as shameful. *γυμνός* means: (a) unclothed; (b) shabbily dressed; (c) forcibly stripped; (d) not properly dressed. The latter was the case with Peter. See OEPKE, TWNT, I, p. 773 f. Peter wrapped his coat, *ἐπενδύτης*, round himself (cf. 2 Co. 5 : 2, 4, to be clothed upon, *ἐπενδύομαι*). This is a garment that was worn over another garment. Here it is a kind of tunic that was worn over the shirt; STRACK-BILLERBECK, II, p. 587. KEULERS, Joannes, states the opinion of Lagrange, who envisages a kind of smock put on over one's clothes, a hypothesis that Keulers rejects. On the other hand DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 145, note 4, says: "Volles Unbekleidetsein ist hier vom Erzähler vorausgesetzt und für Fischer, die in tieferes

of about 200 cubits, i.e. about 100 yards, in the boat, dragging the net with the fish.¹ When they had come ashore they saw a "fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread." Many older exegetes, including Chrysostom, saw a new miracle in this: a creation out of nothing!² However, it is obvious that the fire had been laid, etc., in natural fashion by other fishermen.³ At Jesus' command the disciples landed their fish, under the direction of Peter, who went on board for that purpose. According to BULTMANN, verses 9-11 must be so interpreted that the disciples, together with Peter, had brought the boat ashore and had jumped out, and that Peter, at Jesus' command, then went to the shore and pulled up the net. BULTMANN says that Peter could not possibly have gone on board, since the net was not in the boat at all!⁴ To loosen the net from the boat somebody would first have had to go on board in any case; that somebody was Peter.

The net was found to be full of large fish: "and for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken," verse 11. In all kinds of ways the wonderful element is brought to the fore — the full net — the "great fishes" — "an hundred and fifty and three" — the fact that the net did not break. Many therefore believe that this verse, and consequently the figure of 153 as well, has a hidden meaning and must be explained allegorically. But up to now no-one has been able to find a satisfactory explanation for the figure of 153.⁵ However,

Wasser gehen müssen, natürlich, auch wenn man nicht die nackten Schiffer ägyptischer Abbildungen voraussetzt."

¹ For the various nets see p. 671.

² Cf. BENIGL, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*. They saw: *de improvviso*. *Miraculum*. GROTIUS, *Annotaciones in libros Evangeliorum*: "Christ displays a still greater power, creating something from nothing" (*Majorem iam potestatem Christus ostendit res creans ex nihilo*) . . . KEULERS, *Joannes*: "John does not say whether the fire, the fish and the bread were prepared by Jesus in ordinary or miraculous fashion." BARRETT, *St John*: "To find fish already cooking on the fire before the fish caught by the disciples had been brought is contrary to what might be expected. It is possible that two stories have been combined, in one of which the disciples caught and brought the fish, while in the other Jesus provided the meal."

³ DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 148. Dalman states how he ate fish on the shore of the Sea of Galilee which had been grilled in a fire of glowing coals.

⁴ BULTMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 544. Bultmann believes that he has found all kinds of inconsistencies which are the fault of an editor. He then makes corrections himself.

⁵ A number of explanations follow. It is said that in Antiquity the number of species of fish was established as being 153 (Hieronymus). In that case the meaning would be that people of all races will be caught in the net (= the Church). Our question is: all "great peoples," having regard to the "great fishes?" Some

might it not have been that the fishermen, amazed at the enormous catch, began to count the large fish and in that way arrived at the figure of 153, which has been preserved in tradition? This matter-of-fact, sober explanation may seem somewhat "flat," but in our opinion it is preferable to the flights of fancy of symbolism.¹ The disciples, invited to dine by Jesus, ate in silence. None of them dare ask Jesus who He was, verse 12. They accepted the dishes from the hands of the Lord, knowing that it was He, verse 13.

This meal has been regarded as a sign of the heavenly feast or of Communion; in reality it was merely a breakfast, probably eaten standing.² Jesus is not reported as having said "Peace be unto you,"

earlier exegetes divided the number 153 up as follows: 100 represents the pagan world, 50 the Jews and 3 the Trinity. Three times $50 + 3$ is a symbol of the Trinity. The name Simon Jonah has also been calculated in Hebrew letters: $118 + 35 = 153$! The number is therefore thought to relate to Peter. A number of scholars have thought of the 153,600 strangers referred to in 2 Ch. 2 : 17. תלף means both "thousand" and "people;" that is to say, 153 pagan peoples are collected in the net of the Church. One should not haggle about the surplus of 600, says a proponent of this theory, SMITH, *Ecce Deus*, p. 32 f. UBBINK, *Het Evangelie van Johannes*, thinks that the fact that the net did not tear may relate to the unity of the Church. He suspects that we are perhaps closest to the truth: "when we link up 153 with the eschatological parable in Mt. 13 : 47 f." MÁNEK, *Fishers of Men*, is reminded of all peoples by the number 153. The fish is the symbol of the convert and water symbolizes all that is inimical to God. "Before their conversion the Christians were under the water. And we can now develop this picture still farther: After their conversion the Christians are above the water. And whenever they sin, they sink again under the water" (p. 140). BARRETT, *op. cit.*, considers it most likely that the number "represents the full total of those who are 'caught' by the Christian fishermen, the apostles." He points to 153 as "a triangular number, and $= 1 + 2 + 3 \dots + 17$. 17 itself is the sum of 7 and 10, both numbers which even separately are indicative of completeness and perfection. The fish then represent the full total of the catholic and apostolic Church. This observation increases the probability that other features of the story (see vv. 3, 6, 9) should be taken allegorically." As any number chosen at random lends itself to a game of division and combination, the conclusive force of Barrett's game can be reduced to zero.

¹ BISHOP, *Jesus of Palestine*, p. 313, says in clear and straightforward fashion: "There is the haul (though too much should not be made of the coincidence) which does divide so happily into threes—the custom that a third went to the owner of the boat, a third to the owner of the net and a third to the helpers. The number 'stuck' in the fishermen's memory. It is possible that *μεγάλων* means the fish that would normally be marketable, for a catch of this size would have included many ungrown specimens that would be thrown back into the lake; or others described in the parable of the Dragnet as *σαπρός*. Both on the lake shore as by the Mediterranean, the fishermen would sit down, while the net was being pulled inshore, to go through the catch."

² BRANDT, *Das ewige Wort*, says that, paying heed to Peter's activity—pulling up the net—one can from here enter the realm "der Vermutungen." "Petrus

cf. Jn. 20 : 21 and 26, and nothing is said about blessing of the bread, cf. Lk. 24 : 30.

As this catch of fish occurred after Jesus' resurrection, questions can hardly be asked about the "how" of the event. We are completely in the atmosphere of the wonderful. Here the risen Lord acts, coming to remind Peter, the "fisher of men," of an earlier catch of fish. He therefore revealed Himself "in this wise." KEULERS says: "This whole event has a mysterious character. We may therefore assume that the special nature of this appearance, to which John alludes in verses 1 and 14, lies in the very fact that Jesus now manifests himself by actions, in other words that the incident is symbolic in nature."

The 153 large fish indicate in KEULER's view the superabundant fertility of the disciples' preaching. Otherwise the figure has "no special significance." Whilst in the case of the first catch the net did break, see Lk. 5 : 6, now it did not, which "points to the unity of the Church, which despite the large number of unbelievers will remain unimpaired." KEULERS is of the opinion that the wealth of symbolism which we find in this appearance is adequately justified by the mysterious atmosphere in which it is veiled and that enough details remain which cannot be explained symbolically. We agree with the painstaking and thoughtful Roman Catholic exegete KEULERS that symbolism can lend a hand here, but it will always have to be borne in mind that the meaning may be something else.

It seems to us that this "revelation" of Jesus Christ must be regarded as a pendant to Lk. 5 : 1-11 and not as a variant, as BULTMANN thinks.¹ Peter, having become unfaithful to his first call, is reminded of this call by a second startling catch of fish. This catch is the sign of the conversation which Jesus then begins and in which Peter again hears "Follow me" from Jesus' mouth.

zieht das Netz, das Netz der Kirche, mit dem er Menschen fischt unter den Völkern. Alle Völker werden erreicht; 153 ist die Zahl aller Fischgattungen, nach der Zählung auf die sich Hieronymus beruft. Nicht die Jünger geben dem Herrn etwas; er speist sie mit Brot und Fisch. Er speist seine Kirche im Abendmahl; als Auferstandener bleibt er als der Geber des Brotes in seiner Kirche gegenwärtig". See also KEULERS, JOANNES. TRENCH, Notes on the Miracles, p. 462.

¹ Cf. p. 672 . . . It is an "Ostergeschichte." Lk. 5 : 1-11 was doubtless also an "Ostergeschichte" originally. "Wie die Geschichten vom Petrus-Bekenntnis und von der Verklärung Mk. 8, 27-30; 9, 2-8 ursprünglich Ostergeschichten waren, die Mk in das 'Leben Jesu' zurückprojiziert hat, so wird es auch mit Lk 5, 1-11 der Fall sein. (Ev. des Joh. S. 545 f.)." But see DIBELIUS, Die Formgeschichte, p. 110, and BULTMANN, Ergänzungsheft b. Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition, p. 32. BARRETT, op. cit., p. 481. See also BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 162.

According to tradition the encounter between the risen Lord and the disciples took place at the "Seven Spring," where the Tabula or Mensa Christi was shown as the place where Jesus dined with His disciples.¹

¹ DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 147 f. KOPP, *op. cit.*, p. 277 ff. BISHOP, *Jesus of Palestine*, p. 313: "There is the Mensa Christi, shewn today (covered by a small Franciscan chapel); but the locality cannot be far off, as close by there are flag-stones which may well have been the foundation of a jetty in our Lord's time. This Resurrection interlude by the Galilean Lake is perhaps commemorated at the port of Tripoli in the Lebanon; for on Eastern Easter Monday the Greek Orthodox Community takes its food *εις τὸν ἀγίαλόν* and spends the day. This day is always a holiday for everyone; but celebrations always take this form at Tripoli."

XVIII. THE ACCOUNT OF THE STATER

Mt. 17 : 24-27 preserves the account of Jesus' suggestion for procuring the tribute for the temple. In Capernaum Peter was asked by the receivers of this money: "Doth not your master pay tribute?," to which Peter replied: "Yes." It is not clear whether the receivers did not dare to approach Jesus Himself out of respect, or whether they turned to Peter for a particular reason. If Mt. 17 : 24-27 is regarded as a tale woven around the figure of Peter in order to strengthen his esteem and priority, a possibility is advanced but a solution is not given.

According to Ex. 30 : 11-16 all male Israelites above the age of twenty were obliged to give half a shekel for the service in the tabernacle of the congregation.¹ Rich and poor had to give the same. Nehemiah 10 : 32 mentions the obligation: "to charge ourselves yearly with the third part of a shekel for the service of the house of our God." In Jesus' day this temple tribute was half a shekel, i.e. the value of two Attic drachmae, a "didrachma."² All Jews in Palestine and beyond, except women and slaves, were obliged to pay this tribute. The priests believed that they were exempt from it, in the grounds of Lev. 6 : 16, a belief disputed by the scribes, who likewise thought that they could lay claim to exemption. After the destruction of Jerusalem the Romans obliged the Jews to find the same sum every year for the upkeep of the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.³ The tribute was collected shortly before Passover, in the month of Adar, the last month of the Jewish ecclesiastical year. On the first of Adar the collection was announced, on the fifteenth the money was collected in public, on the twenty-fifth it was collected in the temple. The next month, Nisan, marked the beginning of the new Jewish ecclesiastical year.⁴ It therefore emerges

¹ A shekel, שֶׁקֶל, is a twentieth of a daric, see GALLING, *Bibl. Reallexikon*, col. 388 f. Cf. col. 174 ff.; col. 185 ff.; SCHÜRER, *Die Geschichte des jüd. Volkes*, II, p. 243 ff. See also DERRETT, *Peter's penny*.

² δίδραχμον. The Mishna calls the temple tax שֶׁקֶל, not in the sense of the coin שֶׁקֶל (= 1 sela' = 4 drachmae or 4 denarii) but in the sense of "Schegel-abgabe." See STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 760 f., cf. I, p. 293.

³ FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *De bello Jud.*, VII, VI, 6.

⁴ See for this in detail: STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, pp. 760-770. SCHÜRER, *Die*

from Mt. 17 : 25 that we have here the situation before 70 A.D.; specially appointed persons were engaged on collecting the temple tribute.¹ Before Peter, having returned home,² had told of his experience, Jesus forestalled him with the question: "What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers?" When he replied: "Of strangers," Jesus said to him: "Then are the children free," verses 25, 26.³ Unless Jesus had happened to notice this in some ordinary way or the other, we have here a further indication of His special knowledge. By means of an example of the payment of tax to the temporal authorities, Jesus demonstrated that He and His disciples were in essence exempt from taxation. "Sons" may mean both real children of kings and the subjects of a kingdom when these are free from taxation whilst the subject peoples, the "strangers," are under tribute.⁴ However this may be, Jesus called both Himself and His disciples "sons" of another kingdom, the Kingdom of God, so that they owed no tribute. There is thus a distinction between the Jews and the "sons."⁵ The latter enjoy a freedom which

Geschichte des jüd. Volkes, II, p. 259: "Über die tatsächliche Entrichtung dieser Steuer im Zeitalter Christi haben wir verschiedene sichere Zeugnisse." SCHÜRER refers to Mt. 17 : 24; Flavius Josephus, *Antiq.*, XVIII, IX, 1; *De bello Jud.*, VII, VI, 6; *Mishna Tractate Shekalim*; cf. II, p. 55, note 171.

¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 763: "... jede Ortsgemeinde wird bestimmte Personen mit der Entgegennahme der Schegelabgabe für ihren Bezirk beauftragt haben (vgl. οἱ τὰ διδραχμα λαμβάνοντες Mt 17, 24)."

² Jesus' house at Capernaum, cf. Mk. 9 : 33; Mt. 9 : 10, 28.

³ "Tribute," τέλος, **טֶלֶס**, **טֶלֶס**, here means a tax on goods, duty. "Tax," κῆνσος, census, is a direct tax, levied on persons and possessions. See STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 770.

⁴ KLOSTERMANN, op. cit., recalls: "die faktische Steuerfreiheit der römischen Bürger, Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* II² 177 ff."

⁵ Cf. Sukkah 30a: "R. Johanan in the name of R. Simeon b. Yoḥai further said, What is the purport of that which is written, For I the Lord love justice, I hate robbery with iniquity? ¹) This may be compared to a human king who passed through his custom-house and said to his attendants, 'Pay the tax ²) to the tax-collectors.' They said to him, 'But the whole tax, surely, belongs to thee!' He answered them, 'All travellers would learn from me not to evade their payments of tax.' So the Holy One, blessed be He, said, 'I the Lord hate robbery in burnt-offerings; ³) let My children learn from Me and keep away from robbery.'⁴)

¹) Isa. LXI, 8.

²) For the king's own goods.

³) Be'olah E.V. 'with iniquity'. The noun may bear both significations.

⁴) Even although everything belongs to God, and there can, therefore, technically be no robbery in offering a sacrifice to God (ed. Epstein; transl. J. W. Slotki). STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 771, who refers to Sukkah 30a, remarks that it contains the idea of freedom from tax, which is, however, rejected for certain reasons.

may not, however, give offence. ¹ "Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast an hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take, and give unto them for me and thee." A swift change from the question of the tribute to the fisherman's art!

Sometimes the fisherman fished standing in the water with a line to which a fish hook was attached. ² The piece of money envisaged had to be a stater, which had the value of four drachmae and therefore would be enough to pay the tribute for two persons.

Matthew does not say that Peter did in fact carry out Jesus' instructions. This strange story, told by only one Evangelist, has given rise to various hypotheses and ingenious finds. SCHLEIERMACHER calls it "incomprehensible," which is not surprising, considering his attitude towards miracles. ³ Many compare the account with analogous stories. They then suggest that a similar legend stole into the tradition of the Gospel of Matthew. FIEBIG recalls the story from the Babylonian Talmud, which in his opinion can hardly be older than the period of the Amoraim. ⁴ Many investigators point

¹ SCHLIER, TWNT, II, p. 497: the "sons" of the heavenly kingdom, who are "free," accept the existing regulations out of love—"lest we should offend them"—*ἵνα δὲ μὴ σκανδαλίσωμεν αὐτούς*—and pay their taxes. "Darin üben sie gerade ihre Freiheit aus, Mt. 17, 24 ff." In our opinion Mt. 17 : 24 ff. is concerned with wise policy and indulgence rather than love. STÄHLIN, TWNT, VII, p. 350 f.: *σκανδαλίζω* bedeutet hier zunächst: durch Gesetzesübertretung (Ex 30, 13) Anstoß geben und Empörung verursachen." Cf. BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 195. BÜCHSEL, TWNT, I, p. 265, remarks that the *ἄλλότριος*, the stranger also means: "was nicht mit dem in Rede stehenden Subjekt zusammengehört;" here, therefore, it is in contrast with the "sons."

² DALMAN, Orte u. Wege, p. 144. Cf. GALLING, op. cit., col. 168. Bronze fish hooks have been found in tell Hadjul.

³ SCHLEIERMACHER, Das Leben Jesu, p. 228.

⁴ FIEBIG, Jüd. Wundergeschichten, p. 62 f. . . . Shabbath 119a: "Joseph-who-honours-the-Sabbaths had in his vicinity a certain gentile who owned much property. Soothsayers ¹⁾ told him, 'Joseph-who-honours-the-Sabbaths will consume all your property.' ²⁾ (So) he went, sold all his property, and bought a precious stone with the proceeds, which he set in his turban. As he was crossing a bridge the wind blew it off and cast it into the water, (and) a fish swallowed it. (Subsequently) it (the fish) was hauled up and brought (to market) on the Sabbath eve towards sunset. 'Who will buy now?' cried they. 'Go and take them to Joseph-who-honours-the-Sabbaths,' they were told, 'as he is accustomed to buy.' So they took it to him. He bought it, opened it, found the jewel therein, and sold it for thirteen roomfuls ³⁾ of gold denarii ⁴⁾. A certain old man met him (and) said, 'He who lends to the Sabbath, ⁵⁾ the Sabbath repays him'."

¹⁾ Lit., 'Chaldeans.'

²⁾ It will eventually pass into his possession.

³⁾ R. Tam translates: vessels.

to the legend of Polycrates' ring.¹ SAINTYVES has collected a number of ring and key legends: bishops' rings, thrown away, were brought back by fish; a queen's ring was found in a fish, etc.² The temples of Aphrodite and Tyche were often alongside ponds in which consecrated fish, adorned with gold, swam.³ SAINTYVES wonders whether the food given to these fish served as a sacrifice. He thinks of Mt. 17 : 24-27, and then says: "Does this not recall those consecrated fish which lived in the sacred fish ponds in the vicinity of the temples?" The anecdote in the Gospel is, according to SAINTYVES, probably derived from some Syrian story or the other.⁴

Besides these hypotheses, which thus envisage derivation and literary dependence,⁵ we also encounter attempts to evade the diffi-

⁴) This, of course, is an exaggeration, and merely implies much money.

⁵) I.e. expends money in its honour (ed. Epstein; transl. H. Freedman).

A similar story, in which observance of the Day of Atonement is featured, is given in Gn R. 11 (8b); see STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 614 with reference to Mt. 12: 1.

¹ HERODOTUS, Hist., III, 40-42. A certain Polycrates ruled over the island of Samos. He was fortunate in all things, and he concluded a treaty of friendship with the Egyptian King Amasis. When Polycrates' power grew in alarming fashion, Amasis sent Polycrates a letter, drawing his attention to the dangers of prosperity and advising him as follows: decide what your dearest possession is and throw it so far away that it never returns to men. Polycrates followed Amasis' advice and threw into the sea a very valuable gold signet ring, set with an emerald, far from the coast of the island. Upon his return home he regretted his loss. "But on the fifth or the sixth day thereafter the following happened. A fisherman who had caught a fine big fish considered it worthy of presentation to Polycrates. He took it to the palace gate and said that he wished to appear before Polycrates. When he was admitted to the presence, he said the following as he handed over the fish: 'O King, when I caught this fish, I did not think it fit to take it to market, although I must earn my living with my hands, but it seemed right to me that it was worthy of you and your kingdom. I am therefore handing it over to you herewith.'

He rejoiced at these words and answered as follows: 'You have acted very well and deserve double thanks, both for your words and for your gift. We shall invite you to the meal.' The fisherman considered this a great honour and went home; now the servants who cut the fish open found Polycrates' signet ring. No sooner had they seen it than they removed it quickly, took it joyfully to Polycrates and told him as they handed the signet ring over how it had been found. Now as he regarded the case as something divine, he wrote down in a book all that he had done and sent what he had written to Egypt."

² SAINTYVES, *Essais de Folklore Biblique*, p. 365 f.

³ SAINTYVES, op. cit., p. 394 f. — PLINY, Nat. Hist. XXXII, VIII. "At Hieropolis in Syria the fish in the pond of Venus obey the voice of the temple ministers; they come at their call adorned with gold (*vocati veniunt exornati auro*), fawning to be scratched, and offer gaping mouths to receive their hands."—See also BETZ, *Lukian von Samosata und das N.T.*, p. 33 ff.

⁴ SAINTYVES, op. cit., p. 404.

⁵ STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu*, II, p. 198 f., sees: "als Veranlassung dieser Anek-

culties by means of highly imaginative suppositions or a certain interpretation of the text. Venturini, for instance, invented a dialogue between the receivers and Peter. Jesus ordered His disciple to catch a fish and make sure that when he removed the hook he did not tear the mouth, so that the fish would still be suitable for salting: then it would be worth a stater! ¹ A certain interpretation of the text is to be found in PAULUS. "The fish that first cometh up" does not mean to him the first in number, but the first suitable one. Peter had to catch as many fish as could be sold for a stater in Capernaum, or one fish worth a stater. ² He explains the opening of the mouth as follows: "as soon as you have opened its mouth, i.e. freed it from the hook, you can easily get the stater needed, by converting the fish into money." ³

The word "find" here therefore does not mean encounter, but "receive by sale." ⁴ STRAUSS comments regarding this that the word "find" may refer to the sale, but then it must be evident from the context. However, nothing is said about taking the fish to market; all that is said is: open his mouth. ⁵

F. BARTH considers it possible "that Jesus originally thought of the market value of the fish and that a common metaphor which he used when so doing was transformed by the oral tradition into the proclamation of a miracle: Peter would find a coin 'in the mouth of a fish'." ⁶ An exegete's opinion quoted by PAULUS, in which

dote das vielbenützte Thema von einem Fischfang des Petrus auf der einen, und die bekannten Erzählungen von Kostbarkeiten, die im Leibe von Fischen gefunden werden, auf der andern Seite." Peter is the fisherman in the Gospels. "Das Wertvolle des Fangs tritt nun hier als Geldmünze heraus, welche, wie dergleichen Dinge sonst im Bauche von Fischen, so durch eine Steigerung des Wunders, gleich im Maule des Fisches gefunden werden sollte." The temple tax can, as it happens, be tied up with this anecdote through an actual pronouncement by Jesus . . . K. L. SCHMIDT, RGG, III, col. 145: "Die Wundergeschichte von der Tempelsteuer, bei der die nötige Münze im Fischmaul gefunden wird (Mtth 17, 24-27), erinnert mit diesem 'Motiv' geradezu an die Erzählung vom Ring des Polykrates." Cf. MENSCHING, Das Wunder im Glauben u. Aberglauben der Völker, p. 44. KLOSTERMANN, Das Matthäusevangelium: "... die Darstellung des Mt scheint den Märchen vom Schatz im Fisch verwandt."

¹ See SCHWEITZER, *Gesch. d. Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, p. 46.

² PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch*, II, p. 501. The first fish: "diesen, jenen, d.i. jeden zunächst an den Angel aufsteigenden—bis es hinreicht. Für Petrus konnte der Sinn nicht zweideutig seyn."

³ PAULUS, *op. cit.*, p. 513.

⁴ PAULUS, *op. cit.*, p. 507.

⁵ According to STRAUSS, *op. cit.*, p. 197, as opposed to Paulus' view.

⁶ F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 141. Such a "traditionsgeschichtliche Erklä-

Peter becomes the subject of the "mouth," so that Peter only needed to open his mouth to sell the fish,¹ is rightly rejected by STRAUSS as doing violence to the text.² Besides these explanations we have the interpretation of those who want strictly to maintain the miraculous element. CALVIN remarks that Christ did not say this out of poverty: "but to demonstrate by a miracle that his rule extended further than that of all temporal kings, since even fish owed him tribute."³ According to FILLION Jesus wanted to give His disciples a lesson and to reveal His Messianic dignity.⁴ KEULERS sees in the event: "at least a proof of Jesus' omniscience: he knew that a certain fish had a stater in its mouth and that Peter would catch it. The fish is usually taken to be the *hemichromis sacra* (or Simon Peter's fish), which can easily conceal a stater in its mouth." The fact that Jesus also paid for Peter is "fresh proof that the latter was elected."⁵

What is the correct explanation? The mythical explanation is not a satisfactory one; pointing to a parallel is as such almost meaning-

rung" must not be rejected everywhere. "Setzen wir ruhig ein Fragezeichen, wo die äussere und innere Kritik es uns gebieten." Cf. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Matthäusevangelium*. According to Blass "thou shalt find a piece of money," i.e. the fish, when sold, will bring in enough to pay the tribute, was original. Later it was converted into a nature miracle by the addition "and when thou hast opened his mouth." "Ja selbst die ursprüngliche Meinung des üblichen Textes könnte man allenfalls mit Loisy so zurecht legen: 'sobald du ihn vom Angelhaken losgemacht hast, (*ἀνοίξας τὸ στόμα*), wirst du für ihn einen Stater erhalten'."

¹ PAULUS, op. cit., p. 514: "Wie man sagt: alsdann kostet dich's nur drei Worte und du hast dafür, wie gefunden, was wir jetzt geben sollen." That is to say, in the style of: you have only to open your mouth and there it is!

² STRAUSS, op. cit., p. 197.

³ CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mt 17 : 27: "Quamquam fateor non semper plenos Christo loculos fuisse, non tamen inopia coactum arbitror hoc mandasse Petro: sed ut miraculo probaret se latius dominari quam omnes terrenos Reges, ut qui pisces sibi haberet tributarios. Atque hoc semel tantum legitimus factum esse, quia unum documentum satis in totam vitam fuit."

⁴ FILLION, *Les Miracles de Notre Seigneur Jésus Christ*, II, p. 50: "On avait pratiquement oublié sa dignité supérieure; s'il consent à payer l'impôt du temple, ce sera au moyen d'un miracle. De la sorte, il sera clairement démontré qu'il est le Messie." This miracle shows: "la vraie place à laquelle Jésus a droit dans le royaume des cieux."

⁵ KEULERS, *Matthæus . . . ALLEN*, St. Matthew, also sees the event as a sign of Jesus' omniscience. "The Evangelist probably recorded this tradition as illustrative of Christ's foreknowledge and power, which emphasised His independence from obligation to pay taxes." RUPPRECHT, *Das Wunder in der Bibel*, p. 196 f., does not venture to interpret the miracle of the talking ass as legendary any more than that of the coin in the mouth of the fish. "Warum sollte Jesus die Vollmacht seiner messianischen Sendung nach dem Willen seines Vaters nicht auch einmal auf solche Weise kundgetan haben?" (p. 197).

less. It cannot be denied that the rationalistic explanation has made a serious attempt to arrive at a solution by means of the text. Questions such as: how could the fish take the bait whilst it had a coin in its mouth?; ¹ was there no stater in the house?; did the fish already have the coin in its mouth, or was it supplied with it at that moment?; was not a stater a high price for a fish? create a childish and far-fetched impression, but they may be asked. However, they are unimportant compared with the key question: did Jesus in fact want a miracle such as this, which has the characteristics of a wonder? Causing a coin to be found in the mouth of a fish as a demonstration of rule over temporal kings (Calvin) or as a revelation of Messianic dignity (Fillion) does after all give rise to questions! LEVERTOFF and GOUDGE therefore believe that the fact that it is not stated whether the miracle took place confirms the view "that our Lord's words were not meant seriously." ²

When passing judgment on this account, it will have to be borne closely in mind that in three respects it differs from the other miracle stories. In the first place, Jesus appears to want to help Himself in miraculous fashion, which occurs nowhere else. ³ In the second place the motive for paying the tribute is merely so that the Jews will not be offended. This indulgence, which Jesus exercises whilst preserving His own freedom and His own insight, must rather

¹ OBBINK, *Oosters Leven*, II, p. 9, points to the statement by some authors that a species of fish in the Sea of Galilee swims around for a long time with its eggs or its young in its mouth . . . BISHOP, *Jesus of Palestine*, p. 160, states that in the Twenties and Thirties of this century most pilgrims in Galilee ate St Peter's fish, as the "musht" is commonly called. "The word means 'comb' because of the dorsal fin . . . An official of the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries, after studying the habits of this fish when spawning, said he was convinced that it was possible for a coin to be found in its mouth."

² P. P. LEVERTOFF and H. L. GOUDGE, *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*. "Our Lord's words concerning the money in the mouth of a fish may be but a playful allusion to Peter's trade, and perhaps also an ironical allusion to the Jews' thirst for startling miracles. The fact that the miracle is not reported to have taken place seems to confirm the idea that our Lord's words were not meant seriously . . . Our Lord's beautiful words about sonship do not involve the acceptance of the miracle."

³ ALBERTZ, *Die Botschaft des Neuen Testaments*, I, 1, p. 137: "Das einzige Selbsthilfewunder, das zwar nicht erzählt, aber vorausgesetzt wird, ist die Bereitstellung der Tempelsteuersumme für Jesus und Petrus durch den Stater im Fischmaul, eine Legende, die daher von den Herrenworten aus kritisch anzusehen sein wird, Mt. 17, 24-27." LEVERTOFF and GOUDGE, *op. cit.* "It seems contrary to our Lord's self-imposed limitations for Him to use miracles for the supply of His own personal needs; for these He relies upon the Father's providence (cf. 4, 3.4)."

be seen as an expression of wise policy than as a display of love.¹ And thirdly it is not stated whether the miracle really took place, as various scholars have pointed out already.²

The story therefore amounts essentially to this: Jesus regards the paying of the tribute as a financial matter, an obligation, which if necessary can be fulfilled by catching a fish.

We consequently share F. Barth's opinion that it is possible that Jesus originally referred to the market value of the fish, but that the pronouncement acquired its present form in tradition.

¹ Cf. p. 682... The Jews could doubtless have interpreted a refusal as an inimical attitude.

² DIBELIUS, *Die Formgeschichte*, points to the possibility of non-Christian influences in the accounts (p. 97, note 2). According to BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 233, the account lies outside the framework of the miracle stories: "denn das Wunder ist Nebensache, der lehrhafte Zweck die Hauptsache." Cf. p. 34 f. DODD, *History and the Gospel*, says that Mt. 17 : 24-27 "is pertinent to the question of the payment of the Temple tax by Jewish Christians who no longer felt themselves to be within the Jewish community. That question is hardly likely to have become acute in the stage of Church life represented by the early chapters of Acts, and still less likely during the lifetime of Jesus. The story is suspected, not without good reason, of being a later accretion" (p. 90 f.). BARTH, K.D., IV, 2, p. 245, comments that the miracle in Mt. 17 : 27 is: "freilich nur" indicated. ALBERTZ, *op. cit.*, I, 1, p. 136. Cf. *id.*, *Die synopt. Streitgespräche*, p. 137 f. MENOUD, *La Signification du Miracle dans le Nouveau Testament*, p. 188 f., is of the opinion that in this account: "la signification originale du miracle chrétien," viz. the "idée théologique," is missing. "Le plus simple est d'admettre que nous avons, à la base de la péricope, une parole prononcée par Jésus et transformée en récit par la tradition, et par une tradition qui avait du miracle une notion différente de celle qui apparaît en général dans les évangiles."

XIX. THE CURSING OF THE FIG TREE

The only miracle which Jesus is said to have performed at Jerusalem, and at the same time the only one which may be called a "punitive miracle," is described in Mt. 21 : 18-22 and Mk. 11 : 12-14; 20-24.

The texts are not identical in wording. The timetable in Matthew differs from Mark's. In Matthew it is as follows: First day: entry into Jerusalem (21 : 1-11), cleansing of the temple (21 : 12-17), departure from the city for Bethany (21 : 17). Second day: cursing and withering of the fig tree (21 : 18-20). Jesus' teaching (21 : 21-22).

In Mark the timetable extends over three days:

First day: entry into Jerusalem (11 : 1-10); visit to the temple and return to Bethany (11 : 11).

Second day: cursing of the fig tree (11 : 12-14); cleansing of the temple (11 : 15-19).

Third day: the discovery that the fig tree had withered (11 : 20-21), Jesus' teaching (11 : 22-26).¹

Mt. 21 : 19 does not contain the words present in Mk. 11 : 13: "if haply he might find anything thereon" or "for the time of figs was not yet." The curse in Matthew is: "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforward for ever;" in Mark it is: "No man eat fruit of thee hereafter for ever."

In Matthew the text continues as follows after the cursing: "And presently the fig tree withered away. And when the disciples saw it, they marvelled, saying, How soon is the fig tree withered away!" verses 19, 20. Mark states that the disciples "heard" Jesus curse the fig tree, 11 : 14, and this concludes the first part of the account. He goes on to say how the temple was cleansed, verses 15-18, this account being concluded by: "And when even was come, he went

¹ See ALLEN, *St. Matthew*; KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium* . . . BULTMANN, *Die Geschichte der synopt. Tradition*, p. 232 f., classifies Mk. 11 : 12-14, 20 and parallel passage among the "Wundergeschichten." "Es ist anzunehmen, dass die Verfluchung und ihr Erfolg ursprünglich zusammen berichtet waren, und dass die Trennung durch V. 15-19 auf einer redaktionellen Tätigkeit beruht, die auch den freilich nicht ursprünglichen, aber doch auf einer früheren Traditionsstufe wohl einmal bestehenden Zusammenhang von 11, 15-19 mit 11, 27-33 zerrissen hat (s. S. 18 f.) . . . Jetzt läuft die Geschichte in ein Apophthegma aus (V. 21-26), was sicher sekundär ist . . ." Cf. pp. 58-60 and p. 24.

out of the city," verse 19. Then Mark takes up the thread of the fig tree story again. "And in the morning, as they passed by, they saw the fig tree dried up from the roots. And Peter calling to remembrance saith unto him, Master, behold, the fig tree which thou cursedst is withered away," verses 20, 21. We note a considerable difference between the short, matter-of-fact account in Mt. 21 : 19: "and presently the fig tree withered away" and the careful statement that the withering was "from the roots," Mk. 11 : 20. According to Matthew it was the disciples who asked Jesus, whilst according to Mark Peter "called to remembrance" Jesus' cursing of the tree.

After this list of the striking differences — we shall leave out of consideration the problems associated with the questions of priority, adaptation of the account (abridgment or expansion?) and possible influences in the adaptation (the separate mention of Peter's name), etc. — we shall make a number of exegetic comments.

The place where Jesus and His disciples spent the night was Bethany, on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives.¹ Both Matthew and Mark mention that Jesus was hungry. Had Jesus spent the night in prayer, so that He was hungry? However this may be, on the way to Jerusalem He saw a fig tree by the side of the road — Mark adds "afar off" — and went to it: "if haply he might find any thing thereon." For the tree was in leaf, but did this justify the thought that the tree would be bearing edible fruit at this time around Passover? DALMAN states that the fig tree is still very much at home today on the warm eastern slopes of the Mount of Olives. It might be assumed that the fruit was developing satisfactorily, but, says DALMAN, "it is out of the question that the figs were ripe around Passover. For in April there are only undeveloped figs, many of which fall off, or at best fully developed ones, which are, however, without juice, and are nothing like the ripe, juicy 'early figs,' which cannot be expected until June, let alone the real, less juicy 'figs' of the main harvest, which become ripe on the year's new shoots in August." As it was not the season for figs, Mk. 11 : 13 can only mean "that the full foliage of the tree at a most unusually early time rightly promised something out of the ordinary with regard to the fruit, too. If the fruit lacked vegetative force, the tree was rank and offered no pros-

¹ See DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 265 ff., *idem*, *Jerusalem u. sein Gelände*, p. 249 ff. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Ev.*, p. 328 f. STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 855. Cf. the chapter: The Resurrection of the Dead, with reference to Jn. 11.

pects for the future either.”¹ STRACK-BILLERBECK also devotes considerable attention to this matter. He discusses the phases of development of fruit trees, in particular the fig tree, as they were described and calculated by the rabbis with a view to the proceeds of the tithes. The calculation was as follows: when the fruit set on a tree before the fifteenth of Shebat (about February), the fruit which developed was counted as belonging to the preceding year; if the fruit set after the fifteenth of Shebat, it belonged to the next year. Now experience had shown that there was a period of 40 to 50 days between the sprouting of the leaves on the fig tree and the ripening of the first figs. Consequently, says STRACK-BILLERBECK, Jesus could not “of course hope to find fruit on these young shoots in the week of Passover, even if the tree was in full leaf.” But, he goes on to say, there is another possibility. The Tosephta also speaks of trees — and the fig tree is in the foremost ranks of these — on which an earlier fruit set does not develop until later. And Jesus might well have expected such a fruit on a promising tree in Passover week!²

L. BAUER, on the other hand, does not have wintered figs in mind. He believes that Jesus, as a son of the soil, was looking on that April morning for unripe early figs.³ Others again assert that wintered figs hardly ever occur and that green figs are inedible. Jesus was hungry, but He did not go to the tree to try and still His

¹ DALMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 277 f. Dalman gives the Arabic names of the various fruits. Cf. GALLING, *Bibl. Reallexikon*, col. 85: “Der Feigenbaum (te’ ênâ) ist doppeltragend: er brachte Frühfeigen (bikkūrâ) und Spät- oder Sommerfeigen (te’ ênâ) . . . Man ass die Früchte roh oder als Dörrfeigen bzw. Feigenkuchen (debêlâ), der aus frischen durchgekneteten Feigen hergestellt wurde. Durch aufgiessen von Wasser auf Feigenkuchen konnte man ein Feigenbier gewinnen.”

² STRACK-BILLERBECK, I, p. 856 f. “Aber die Tos redet auch von Bäumen — u. der Feigenbaum gehörte in erster Linie zu ihnen —, an denen sich Fruchtansatz bereits vor dem 15. Schebat, also mindestens 45 Tage vor dem 1. Nisan fand. Das waren Früchte, die in der letztjährigen Vegetationsperiode angesetzt hatten, aber im Vorjahre nicht mehr zur Entwicklung gelangt waren. [Wird doch von einigen Feigenarten ausdrücklich berichtet, dass ihre Früchte erst im zweiten oder dritten Jahr am Baum zur Reife gelangten.] Wenn dann im folgenden Frühjahr die Natur zu neuem Leben erwachte u. der Saft anfang in die Bäume zu steigen, begann auch für diese alten Fruchtansätze eine neue Entwicklungsperiode. Eine solche Frucht konnte Jesus in der Passahwoche, also etwa 55 Tage nach dem 15. Schebat, gar wohl erwarten, zumal an einem Baum, dessen volles Laub seine Kraft u. Gesundheit zu verbürgen schien.”

³ L. BAUER, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*, p. 142 f. “Mit ziemlicher Sicherheit dürfen im März und April von einem kräftigen Baum mit schönen, grünen Blättern in gutem Boden und sonniger Lage Ansätze zu Frühfeigen erwartet werden.”

hunger, but merely for the sake of symbolism.¹ CALVIN says that he most prefers the interpretation "that the hunger gave him reason to perform a miracle and to teach his disciples."²

As regards the details of the account, there are thus fairly divergent opinions, which also applies to the event itself, for views are greatly divided about both the intention and the fact itself, whereas there is not much difference of opinion about the symbolic significance.

(a) *The intention.*

What could have induced Jesus to accomplish this feat? How can the performance of a punitive miracle on an inanimate object be reconciled with Jesus' love for all things? Surely we are not concerned here with divine wrath, *ira deum*, such as we find in the world of ideas of the Greeks and the Romans?³ SCHLEIERMACHER considers the cursing of the fig tree, which as a moral action has the form of a punitive miracle, incomprehensible.⁴

WOOLSTON subjects this miracle to severe and sarcastic criticism. The cursing of the fig tree "appears to be such an absurd, foolish, and ridiculous if not malicious and ill-natured Act in Jesus" that it simply cannot be ascribed to an intelligent man. Had hunger made Jesus so irritable? Must He, who could provide food for others, fly into such a passion? Moreover, had Jesus the right to another's fruit? WOOLSTON goes on and on with his questions in this vein.⁵ DE LOOSTEN believes that the "completely pointless

¹ KEULERS, *Mattheüs*. Keulers cites Lagrange here. "We may assume that Jesus was really hungry, but that his act had for the rest only symbolic significance."

² CALVIN, *Comm. in quatuor Evangelistas*, re Mt. 21 : 18: "... et ego in hanc conjecturam magis inclino, quod fames illi ad miraculum edendum, suosque docendos occasio fuerit." Calvin does not consider it incongruous to say: "that according to men he was unaware of the species of tree, but that it was possible that he went there deliberately, not unaware of the outcome" (*Sed nihil absurdi est si dicamus, secundum hominem speciem arboris fuisse illi incognitam: fieri tamen potest ut consulto accesserit, eventum non ignorans*). According to Calvin the significance of the miracle is as follows: "Now he wanted symbolically to depict in the tree what fate awaits hypocrites and at the same time to demonstrate how vain and worthless their outward show is" (*Voluit autem in arbore symbolum proponere qualis tandem exitus maneat hypocritas, et simul detegere quam inanis sit ac nihili eorum ostentatio*).

³ See KLEINKNECHT, *TWNT*, V, p. 388 ff.

⁴ SCHLEIERMACHER, *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 228. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth*, p. 269, speaks of "a gross injustice on a tree which was guilty of no wrong and had but performed its natural function."

⁵ WOOLSTON, *Discourses on the Miracles*, Third Discourse, p. (4). Regarding

cursing" was the product of Jesus' "highly nervous, overstrained state" after the entry.¹

How is Jesus' wrath to be interpreted? STÄHLIN says that, although it is seldom referred to expressly, the wrath is nevertheless "an integral trait of the picture of Jesus given by the Gospels." Jesus is "a man of flesh and blood," but His wrath is "never too human a wrath." STÄHLIN thinks that in the cursing of the fig tree "the question of the justice of his wrath" also arises for Jesus, and he is of the opinion that the "offensive" aspect here and elsewhere in the Gospels serves the purpose of stressing the seriousness of the subject. Jesus' wrath here is directed against those who withhold from Him the fruits of penance and conversion.²

STÄHLIN's argument in no way eliminates the objection, since it does not satisfactorily answer the concrete question why this fig tree, which happened to bear no fruit, had to be cursed to be able to serve as a symbolic intermediary!

(b) *The fact*

In Matthew's version the fig tree withered "presently." (This is the old meaning of presently, in the sense of "immediately.") In other words, the disciples, during the very short period of their halt at the tree, saw it change and wither before their eyes so thoroughly that they "marvelled," Mt. 21 : 20. According to Mark's text, there is a day in between, but the fact is just as surprising.

Now we should like to point out that we do not doubt the possibi-

Jesus' hunger: "But to curse the Fig-tree upon it, was as foolishly and passionately done, as for another Man to throw the Chairs and Stools about the House, because his Dinner is not ready at a critical Time, or before it could be got ready for him," (p. 5). "What if Jews and Infidels should say, that Jesus, being minded to impose on his Disciples and Followers, took a secret Opportunity beforehand to lay his Carpenter's Ax to the Root of this Tree, and so imperceptibly circumcised it, as that the Leaves did, what they will do, wither in a Night and a Day's Time. God forbid, that I should think, Jesus did so; but as to the Possibility of such Fraud in an Impostor, none can doubt of it" [p. (14) f.].

¹ DE LOOSTEN, *Jesus Christus vom Standpunkte des Psychiaters*, p. 77 f.

² STÄHLIN, *TWNT*, V, p. 428 ff. . . . "und in einer befremdenden Gleichnis-handlung (335) offenbart er seinen Zorn über diejenigen, die ihm die Früchte der Busse vorenthalten (Mk 11, 14; vgl. Lk 13, 7)." Note 335: "Bei der zornigen Verfluchung des Feigenbaumes taucht auch für Jesus die Frage nach der Gerechtigkeit seines Zornes auf; denn die Zeit der Feigenreife war längst vorbei (vgl. die Komm.). Es liegt hier wohl einer der vielen anstössigen Züge in Gleichnisreden u -handlungen Jesu vor, die den einzigen Zweck haben, die Aufmerksamkeit auf das Dargestellte zu lenken u dessen aktuellen Ernst eindrucklich zu machen" (p. 429 f.).

lity of a sudden marvellous withering. When discussing the wine miracle at Cana we said that the factual as such, however strange it may appear, may not form the criterion. However, the point at issue is whether all that can be derived from the accounts handed down about the cursing of the fig tree is that the fact did indeed happen!

Many exegetes believe this to have been a historical event. Some even suppose that the process of withering had already begun to affect the tree, but was accelerated by Jesus' action.¹

However, it seems to us that there are well-founded reasons for doubting the historicity. We are not guided here by humanitarian or emotional considerations; the appeal to the "helplessness" or "innocence" of a tree, for the sake of that tree as a living being of nature, has a somewhat sentimental character. VIOLET has endeavoured to eliminate the offence of the cursing by replacing the curse by sadness and disappointment. He believes that this is possible on philological grounds. But in that case the text of Mk. 11 : 14 must be regarded as the original one which, according to VIOLET, may be read as follows: "The Son of Man will never eat fruit from you again," which means that Jesus will never ask the tree for fruit, since after all He is on the way to His death.²

Now whether or not the cursing can be softened to disappointment, we believe that the following indications firmly support the view that this is not a real event:

¹ For instance NEANDER, *Das Leben Jesu Christi*, p. 637 f. "Wir müssen vielmehr voraussetzen, dass in derselben Ursache, von welcher es herrührte, dass dieser Baum nur Blätter ohne Früchte hervorbrachte, längst das gänzliche Verdorren desselben vorbereitet war und durch die Einwirkung Christi diese in dem Gesetz der Natur begründete Krisis nur beschleunigt wurde." In this way the gradual withering of the Jewish people was symbolized. LEWIS, *Miracles*. "As a miracle it again does in focus, repeats small and close, what God does constantly and throughout Nature" (p. 168 f.).

² VIOLET, *Eucharisterion*. Festschrift H. Gunkel II, Art. "Die Verfluchung des Feigenbaumes," p. 136 ff. Violet believes that he can remove the stain. He considers the account historical: "das entscheidende Wort Jesu aber für entstellt durch die Überlieferung." What could Jesus have said in Aramaic? See the Syrian translation: it is: "no man *will* eat." "Also die scheinbare Verwünschung braucht nur eine Vorhersagung gewesen zu sein." For philological reasons Violet proposes the following version: "barnascha la jekhal:" "der Menschensohn wird nie wieder von dir Früchte geniessen." "Wenn meine Deutung richtig ist, so ist also die 'Verfluchung' des Feigenbaumes überhaupt keine Verfluchung oder Verwünschung gewesen, sondern lediglich ein Wort der Enttäuschung und Betrübniß: 'Du hast die Zeit verpasst: nie wieder werde ich von dir Früchte erbitten:' begreiflich auf dem Todeswege Jesu."

1. The accounts in Matthew and Mark will have to be compared first of all with Lk. 13 : 6-9, in which Jesus' parable of the unfertile fig tree is given. This parable speaks of someone who "came and sought fruit thereon, and found none," verse 6. Nothing is said about withering, but the tree is threatened with cutting down. It is significant that the account of the suddenly withered fig tree is not to be found in Luke.

2. A comparison of the New Testament account with Jer. 8 : 13, Hosea 9 : 10, 16 and Micah 7 : 1 gives food for thought.¹ Both the vine and the fig tree are several times mentioned in the Old Testament to elucidate the state of mind of the people of Israel. The close resemblance between Hos. 9 : 16 and Mk. 11 : 20 justifies the surmise that the Evangelist was acquainted with the text of Hosea, just as he also knew Isaiah and Jeremiah, cf. Mk. 11 : 17.

3. Both the disciples, Mt. 21 : 20, and Peter, Mk. 11 : 21, asked Jesus for an explanation of what had happened. Jesus gave no explanation, but called upon His disciples to have faith. From the text of Mt. 21 : 21 it can only be concluded that the withering of the fig tree had to serve as a demonstration of Jesus' power. The tree was cursed and withered because Jesus found no fruit on it to still His hunger.

4. If we have to assume the latter point as motive, we must establish that Jesus performed the miracle, and a punitive miracle at that, for His own benefit. However, nowhere do we encounter such an idea in the Gospels.²

At the same time it may be asked whether Mk. 11 : 22-27 originally appeared in whole or in part in another context — note related utterances elsewhere in the Gospels — but then there is no end to the stringing together of surmises.³

¹ Jer. 8 : 13: "I will surely consume them, saith the Lord: there shall be no grapes on the vine, nor figs on the fig tree, and the leaf shall fade; and the things that I have given them shall pass away from them." Hosea 9 : 10: "I found Israel like grapes in the wilderness; I saw your fathers as the firstripe in the fig tree at her first time." Hosea 9 : 16: "Ephraim is smitten, their root is dried up, they shall bear no fruit: yea, though they bring forth, yet will I slay even the beloved fruit of their womb." Micah 7 : 1: "Woe is me! for I am as when they have gathered the summer fruits, as the grape gleanings of the vintage: there is no cluster to eat: my soul desired the firstripe fruit" . . . In Hosea 9 : 16 the Septuagint has: τὰς ῥίζας αὐτοῦ ἐξηράνθη, their root is dried up; Mk. 11 : 20 has: ἐξηραμμένην ἐκ ῥιζῶν, dried up from the roots.

² Reference might be made to the account of the temple tax, Mt. 17 : 24-27, but the historicity of this account is also highly disputable.

³ Mk. 11 : 23 = Mt. 17 : 20 = Lk. 17 : 6 . . . Mk. 11 : 24, see Mt. 7 : 7;

On the basis of all this internal evidence offered by the text itself, we believe that we must agree with KLOSTERMANN when he says that here in the tradition of Mark and Matthew a few words in the manner of Hos. 9 : 10, 16, Micah 7 : 1 and Lk. 13 : 6-9 "have altered in history."¹ It is possible that a well-known withered fig tree played a part in the original parable, but aetiological speculations will have to be guarded against.²

If one nevertheless wishes to explain the fact symbolically, whilst preserving the historicity, it must be borne in mind that one is taking a daring and dangerous exegetic plunge! For it will have to be remembered that the fig tree withered and so was abandoned to its fate and that — if Jesus meant the Jewish nation — the downfall of the people would in that case be regarded by Jesus as an answer to prayers. KEULERS appreciates the difficulties. He takes the account to be historical; he rightly notes that Jesus does not say a single word about the symbolic meaning of His deed, although he considers it impossible that Jesus' deed can be denied its symbolic meaning.³ Jesus' deed is sometimes compared with the symbolic actions of the prophets, but the same difficulties still occur.⁴

18 : 19; Lk. 11 : 9; Mk. 11 : 25, see Mt. 6 : 15; 18 : 35 . . . Mt. 21 : 21, 22 was edited in close conjunction with the preceding verses, 18-20.

¹ KLOSTERMANN, *Das Markusevangelium*.

² KLOSTERMANN, *op. cit.* "E Schwartz *Zeitschr. f. d. neuest. Wiss.*, 5. 80 ff. vermutete ein Ἀΐτιον: es hätte einen bekannten verdorrten Feigenbaum bei Jerusalem gegeben, von dem christliche Sage erzählte, Jesus habe ihn verflucht, aber vor der Parusie werde er wieder ausschlagen, dagegen Ed. Meyer I 185." . . . DALMAN, *Orte u. Wege*, p. 277: "Es wäre möglich, dass am Wege von Bethanien ein dürrer Feigenbaum stand, von welchem man zu erzählen wusste, er sei durch Jesu Allmachtswort verdorrt, weil er vergeblich an ihm Früchte gesucht hatte." GOPPELT, *TWNT*, VI, p. 20: "Die Verfluchung des Feigenbaumes (Mt 21, 18 f par Mk 11, 12-14, 20 f) kann nur entweder als Gleichnishandlung oder wahrscheinlicher als Gleichnis verstanden werden, das — vielleicht in Anknüpfung an einen bekannten verdorrten Feigenbaum bei Jerusalem — erst durch die Tradition zur Geschichtserzählung geworden ist." FILLION, *Les Miracles de Notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, II, p. 71, calls the explanation based on popular belief in a fig tree cursed by Jesus: "étrange conjecture!"

³ KEULERS, *Mattheüs*. The symbolic meaning "ought to become clear through the later events." Strangely enough, Keulers says immediately afterwards: "Even if we regard the withering of the fig tree merely as a miracle of power, the proverb about faith is still surprising. Perhaps catechism put it here because the fact did not satisfy without a suitable lesson." We do not consider this method of "adding colour" to the exegesis felicitous.

⁴ See Isa. 20 : 1-6; Jer. 13 : 1-11; 19 : 1-13; Ezek. 4 : 1-15, etc. Cf. KEULERS, *op. cit.*; VAN LEEUWEN, *Markus*. F. BARTH, *Hauptprobleme*, p. 107: "Ferner hat Jesus niemals Strafwunder vollbracht . . . Die Verwünschung des Feigenbaums aber ist eine symbolische Handlung, mit welcher das unbussfertige jüdische

On the basis of the various indications mentioned we therefore consider it the most plausible — obviously we shall never advance beyond an opinion — that we are concerned with what was originally a pronouncement or a parable by Jesus which may have undergone some historical surgery in the oral or written tradition.¹

(c) *The symbolic meaning*

Views are fairly unanimous on this. Israel is like a tree with luxuriant foliage but without fruit. The judgment on Israel and Jerusalem is graphically illustrated by the verdict which Jesus passed on the fig tree, as a result of which it withered. DEHN thinks that the cursing of the fig tree and the cleansing of the temple mean the same thing, viz. the judgment on God's people, Israel.² This does not tally entirely in detail, for the temple was "cleansed," but continued to exist, whilst the tree was cursed and immediately withered. KLAUSNER says that it is clear that the Jews, or one of the parties, the Pharisees or the Sadducees, are the subject of this parable: they deserved to be destroyed or to wither because they did not heed the teaching of Jesus.³ According to RUPPRECHT it should

Volk gemeint ist, und welche die Jünger aus dem Gleichnis vom Feigenbaum sich deuten konnten."

¹ We have already pointed to the possible existence of a withered fig tree . . . GOPPELT, TWNT, VI, p. 20, tries to trace and give a place to other essential features as well. "Das Hungern Jesu braucht nicht äusserer Anlass der Gleichnishandlung oder Rahmenmotiv zu sein; es kann ein urspr Zug des Gleichnisses sein. Als solcher würde es besagen: Jesus hungert gleich denen, die er selbst selig preist (Mt 5, 6), nach Frucht der Gerechtigkeit, hier an Israel, u kündigt den Fluch über die an, die ihn vergeblich nach Barmherzigkeit (Mt 9, 13; 12, 7) hungern lassen (vgl Mt 25, 41 ff)" . . . Others who believe that the account developed from a parable include SCHMIEDEL, Hauptprobleme, p. 34: "In Wirklichkeit haben wir hier kein Factum, sondern ein Gleichnis vor uns, eine Parallelerzählung zum Gleichnis vom Feigenbaum, wie es bei Lucas steht, Luc. 13, 6-9." SOLTAU, Hat Jesus Wunder getan?, p. 35 f. STRAUSS, Das Leben Jesu, II, p. 253. It is a parable. Strauss says that Luke gets the prize here for the right tradition. KLAUSNER Jesus of Nazareth, p. 268 f. BARRETT, St. John, p. 323. In a discussion of the historical value of the account of Lazarus' resurrection, Barrett says: "There is ground for thinking that elsewhere (notably Mark 11, 12-14, 20-5) 'miracles' may have developed out of parables . . ." HUNZINGER, TWNT, VII, p. 756 f.

² DEHN, Der Gottessohn . . . Dehn proves to be not averse to dramatized exegesis when he says: "Die Geschichte von der Verfluchung des Feigenbaumes ist keine sanfte und milde Jesusgeschichte. Lodernder Gotteszorn bricht aus der Seele des Sohnes . . . Schauerlich-eindringlich mischen sich Symbol und Wirklichkeit." Cf. BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, Markus. "By his account of the fig tree Mark wishes to stress all the more strongly the ominous aspect of the cleansing of the temple."

³ KLAUSNER, op. cit., p. 268 f.

be observed that "in reality" the story concerns a symbolic action performed on a tree, and "not an actual chastisement of the unfertile people, but instead merely a symbolic homily in concreto, to warn the disciples and, since the disciples doubtless told others of this incident, to warn the people."¹ The extent to which symbolism can inspire a person to profound trains of thought is evident from BORNHÄUSER's reflections. According to his reasoning, the Israelite of those days understood at once what Jesus meant: "for the fig tree had a special meaning for him;" think of Gen. 3 : 6. "It was a tree that brought grief into the world," and therefore "the tree meant something." But here the tree symbolizes Israel, says BORNHÄUSER; the judgment on it symbolizes the judgment which Jesus passes on Israel — with Jerusalem in the forefront.² Another symbolic explanation, to which HAUCK, among others, refers in his commentary, was given by A. SCHWEITZER in his reply to those psychiatrists who believed that they could attribute a mental disease to Jesus. HAUCK says that we can perhaps share SCHWEITZER's view of Jesus' words as Messianic words of power directed at the tree. The Apocalypse of Baruch speaks of a splendid renovation of nature in the days of the Messiah, when the earth will bring forth fruit ten thousand times over. But the tree that once deceived by its foliage the concealed Messiah when He was hungry will be doomed to infertility.³ This symbolism may fit into the eschatolog-

¹ RUPPRECHT, *Das Wunder in der Bibel*, p. 165.

² BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus*, p. 181 f. . . Cf. further for the symbolic significance among others SCHNIEWIND, *Das NTD*, I, 1, p. 141; RICHARDSON, *The Miracle-stories of the Gospels*, p. 56; BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL, *Markus*. Berkelbach van der Sprenkel calls the withering of the fig tree "an event of which the significance is further underlined by what follows about prayer." It relates to God's planting, to Israel. It is unfertile and cursed. "And it is God's deed that it is cursed." . . . Can and may one put all this in this way?

³ SCHWEITZER, *Die psychiatrische Beurteilung Jesu*, p. 42 ff. The psychiatrists do not understand the cursing; they consider it senseless. But one must understand Jesus' action from the point of view adopted by Him. "Da Jesus das messianische Reich als ganz nahe erwartet, bezieht sich das Wort über den Baum auf das Schicksal desselben in der neuen Weltzeit . . . Es handelt sich also nicht um ein sinnloses Toben gegen die Naturordnung, sondern um eine Art von Vorwegnahme zukünftiger Befugnisse, die er auch sonst übt." Cf. Mt. 19 : 28; 11 : 20-24; 23 : 37-38 . . . HAUCK, *Markus*. "Der Feigenbaum soll nicht teilnehmen dürfen an der herrlichen Naturerneuerung (Bar ap 29), welche jetzt mit dem Anbruch der Heilszeit bevorsteht. Jesus spricht dann hier als der über die künftige Welt Gebietende." GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 169, is of the opinion that the nature miracles "were originally told in an atmosphere of apocalyptic eschatology . . . The cursing of the fig-tree is probably based on the expectation of a period of miraculous fruitfulness in the last days."

ical framework erected and developed by Schweitzer, but to agree with it does demand a good deal from the imagination!

To sum up concisely, we may say that, stated in the form of a miracle story, both Matthew's text and Mark's make it clear to the reader that when and where no fruit is given, whilst fruit may be expected, judgment must follow.

HISTORY, MIRACLES AND FAITH

Now that we have come to the end of our investigation, we should like to reconsider a number of salient points for a moment. We believe that the title of this final chapter, History, Miracles and Faith, sums up the whole problem of miracles.

Our study has revealed that we consider the accounts of miracles in the Gospels to be historically reliable. It was the intention of the Evangelists to tell us that something happened and what that something was. Now happenings are history, to which the immediate reaction may be: what do you mean by "history?" For the word history is a wide concept covering several meanings. It is beyond the scope of this study to consider at length "the science of history" as such. Here we interpret history in its elementary meaning of an event, an incident, which took place in a remote or recent past, that is to say in the sense of a factual happening. The first point is thus that "something" happened there, then and in that way. The second point is that what happened can be recounted and interpreted in various ways, so that the oral and written transmission of an event may display a certain accretion and may even entail transformation of the event itself in many cases. It is the task of the historian to approach such events critically, sifting and sorting, instructed and guided by methods of research. The theologian is faced here with the difficult task of the correct "exegesis." Moreover, it will always have to be borne in mind that not only known, but also unknown, factors have played a part in "history."

As civilization progresses, the deepening and widening of human knowledge, in part as the result of the steady supply of new source material, cause views to change, traditional methods to be rejected or revised and experiments to be made with new ones. But all this makes it not only desirable, but also necessary, that investigators in their scientific dealings with one another agree more or less on the meaning of the words that they use. When one of them speaks of "history," the others must have a certain concept or idea, a frame of reference within which they can place the speaker's words. If the speaker introduces a new concept, making use of an old word known in a certain sense, the door is flung open to a hopeless confusion of concepts.¹

¹ ALTHAUS, *Das sogenannte Kerygma u. der historische Jesus*, p. 22 ff., in

Now the Gospels — we shall confine ourselves to the writings given us as the main sources for the miracles of Jesus — contain the “history” of Jesus of Nazareth. We have already remarked that the Gospels are not at all of a biographical nature. Within a relatively narrow historical framework they describe the person, the teachings and the work of Jesus of Nazareth, who is proclaimed as the Son of God, the Messiah of Israel and the Saviour of the world. It is in the *proclamation* of the latter that the “problem” lies, viewed objectively and scientifically. After all, I cannot approach Jesus in the same way as Charlemagne, Napoleon, Winston Churchill, etc. In other words, I cannot give a historical and psychological “picture of Jesus,” or if I do so I must do dreadful violence to page after page of the sources at my disposal. This does not mean to say that such attempts have not been repeatedly made and will not continue to be made, despite the frequently uttered assurance that nobody is capable any longer of writing a “life of Jesus.”¹ It is KÄHLER’s merit that, at a time when the “modern” picture of Jesus was all the vogue, he raised a serious warning voice against it, and it may be described as a sign on the wall that recently this “voice” from 1892 was rerecorded to be heard by the present generation.²

It is not our intention to enter the arena of the present differences of opinion regarding the problem of the “historical Jesus” and the so-called kerygma theology. We have repeatedly mentioned Bultmann, and we would refer to SEVENSTER’s notes for the present

our opinion rightly opposes the views of Bultmann and Gogarten regarding their conception of: “den Begriff der Geschichte und des Geschichtlichen,” which hampers discussion with historians. “Das Vergangene als solches, das sich nicht als ein Geschehen erweist, das mich in Verantwortung und Entscheidung stellt und damit zur Gegenwart für mich wird, wird aus dem Begriff des Geschichtlichen ausgeschlossen. Dieser existentialistische Begriff der Geschichte und des Geschichtlichen findet sich heute bei Theologen und Philosophen. Aber für die Historiker, die ihre Disziplin immer noch als Wissenschaft von der Geschichte, als Erforschung der Geschichte verstehen, kommt er nicht in Frage. Sie können nicht darauf verzichten, auch das vergangene Geschehen als solches Geschichte zu nennen.” See BULTMANN, *History and Eschatology*. See further ROBINSON, *A new Quest of the Historical Jesus*. “A new quest must be undertaken because the kerygma claims to mediate an existential encounter with a historical person, Jesus, who can also be encountered through the mediation of modern historiography” (p. 94).

¹ BORNKAMM, *Jesus von Nazareth*, p. 11; GOODSPEED, *A Life of Jesus*, p. 11.

² KÄHLER, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus u. der geschichtliche, biblische Christus*. “Meinen Mahnruf kann und will ich recht auffallend in das Urteil zusammenfassen: Der historische Jesus der modernen Schriftsteller verdeckt uns den lebendigen Christus” (p. 16).

situation.¹ We should like to point here to a phase of reaction, a turn in the tide, if the expression is preferred: a kerygma theology as proclaimed by R. Bultmann and F. Gogarten, in which, on the strength of an individual concept of history, little if any attention is paid to historical events, provokes reaction just as much as the preaching of a supranaturalistic Christ figure or the reproduction of the "purest" possible historical picture of Jesus did in the past. The situation is far from simple for the historian — and thus for the theologian as well. For the Christ who is preached is the Christ who preaches Himself, and this Christ is the historical Jesus of Nazareth, just as He is described to us in the Gospels and the remaining books of the New Testament.²

Now Jesus Christ manifested Himself not only in what He said, but also in what He did. And deeds can only come to light in a "happening." We have on several occasions referred to God's action in the history of the people of Israel and of the whole world. Reference is repeatedly made in the Bible to the works and deeds of God.³ The God of the Bible is a God of love, of might and power (Grundmann), and as the Son Jesus speaks and acts as part of the love and power of the Father; He acts with power, exousia. On the strength of this Biblical witness concerning Jesus of Nazareth we believe, as has been discussed at length elsewhere, that the miracle may not be given a secondary place beside the word. Word and miracle are

¹ G. SEVENSTER, *Hoofdmomenten uit de studie der Bijbelse Theologie*. See further DE JONGE, *Nieuwe bijdragen tot de Leben-Jesu-Forschung in Duitsland*. RISTOW und MATTHIAE (Hrsg.), *Der Historische Jesus und der Kerygmatische Christus*. SCHNACKENBURG, *Neutestam. Theologie*, p. 30 ff. J. M. DE JONG, *Kerygma*. "The untranslated Greek word 'kerygma' is a, if not *the*, keyword to Bultmann's faith and thought" (p. 16).

² DIEM, *Der irdische Jesus u. der Christus des Glaubens*, p. 9: "Man kann den ganzen Inhalt der neutestamentlichen Verkündigung zusammenfassen als: die Verkündigung von Jesus Christus, der sich selbst verkündigt. Dabei ist Jesus Christus sowohl der Initiator als der Gegenstand als auch das handelnde Subjekt dieser Verkündigung. Diese Verkündigung verläuft innerhalb einer Geschichte, die mit dem irdischen Jesus beginnt und sich über Kreuz und Auferstehung fortsetzt in der apostolischen Verkündigung." TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus*, p. 36: "We cannot see the Jesus of history if we close our eyes to the Christ of faith; we do not see the Christ of faith except in the light of the Jesus of history." See further BARTSCH, *Das historische Problem des Lebens Jesu*. ESKING, *Glaube u. Geschichte in der theologischen Exegese* Ernst Lohmeyers, makes a clear contribution: "zur Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Interpretation." MARXSEN, *Anfangsprobleme der Christologie*, p. 49 ff.

³ See Deu. 11 : 3; 1 Ch. 16 : 8; Ps. 9 : 11; 28 : 5; 66 : 5, 6; 77 : 12-21 ("doings" and "wonders"); 78 : 11 ("works" and "wonders"); 105 : 1; Isa. 12 : 4, etc.

both functions of the Kingdom which are *sui generis*, however "intertwined" they may sometimes appear to be. In both God "behaves" in a certain way, in both He enters into contact with man in his mental and physical need. We therefore cannot share SMELIK's view of Jesus' activity in miracles. For SMELIK is of the opinion that miracles in Jesus' life are part of His "humiliation." "It is wrong to lay too great a stress on Christ's working of miracles," says SMELIK, who furthermore argues that miracles are absent at moments when we would expect them. "Not all the sick are healed, not all the hungry are fed. The twelve legions of angels do not come to help Him. He does not come down from the cross. This thread running through the Gospels is often not noticed, and yet it is most essential to the picture of Jesus given by the Gospels." We agree with Smelik that "too great a stress" may not be laid on the miracles, but we believe that the unanimous testimony of the Gospels regarding Jesus' activity as the "One of Authority" is weakened if insufficient stress is laid on the miracles.¹

VAN RULER has rightly remarked that miracles happen if the Kingdom of God proceeds to function in deeds, just as parables "happen" if it functions in words.² In both cases God makes "history" with man. If a miracle occurs, this "history" becomes something that can be experienced, something that can be seen, something concrete. That is to say, the consequence of the miraculous event becomes visible, but without the deed and the Doer being "proved" before our human eyes in it and through it. After all, a miracle, as part of God's actions, can never be placed in some pigeonhole of ordinary human history. It happens over and above ordinary events, and against the known order of things (*supra et contra naturam*). As an event of *salvation* it is an entirely different happening; it is "con-cealed." And therefore the miracle is disputable; it is susceptible to attack from all sides. Prayer healing, for instance, can always be interpreted as something "incomprehensible." What the believer calls a "miracle" the unbeliever ascribes to "unknown causes." The many ways in which attempts have been made to "explain" miracles in general and those of Jesus in particular (see the Introduction) are consequently quite understandable. They are a product

¹ SMELIK, *De weg van het woord*, p. 111 . . . The examples of the legions of angels and the not coming down from the cross are incorrect; in these cases something quite different is concerned.

² VAN RULER, *De vervulling van de Wet*, p. 40.

of the naturalistic and rational attempt to reduce the "unacceptable" manner in which *salvation* happens in miracles to a happening or a historical account which may be considered "acceptable."

In a short but interesting work KRONER has endeavoured to demonstrate what is in his opinion the main issue. He argues that philosophy is the product of thought, while religion is the product of imagination. According to KRONER, when the most vital human questions are concerned, the latter transcends the former. KRONER calls religious imagination in the sense of Biblical religion "inspired imagination." "The miracle is the peculiar way in which the divine mystery reveals itself in the midst of everyday life."¹ Miracles demonstrate the existence of a power which cannot be "proved" rationally. They can no more be confirmed or rejected by science than the laws of nature can be grasped by the faculty of religious imagination. There is a difference in level.² This remark is correct, and likewise we can distinguish a difference in level in events. With regard to the miracles of Jesus we could put it in the following way. The fact that "something" happened there, then and in that way

¹ KRONER, *The Religious Function of Imagination*, p. 41: "Against the background of this life the appearance of the divine discloses unusual events which prove the presence of a power infinitely superior to nature and ourselves. Nature henceforth serves the purpose of revealing the truth imaged by God."

² *Op. cit.*, p. 42: "They demonstrate the existence of a power which can perform what nature as nature, man as man, cannot perform . . . Of course, the usual senses cannot see this light, it is visible to religious imagination only. Thus the miracles are proofs of the existence of God—of that God, Whose existence cannot be proved by rational means. They are the only adequate manifestations of His existence in the world of senses. To say that they run counter to the laws of nature is to misinterpret; for they happen on a level of meaning where the laws of nature have no place at all. Miracles can be verified or rejected by means of scientific thought as little as the laws of nature can be comprehended with the power of religious imagination; they occur and are meaningful in a sphere quite different from that of science and thought. The language of revelation, being the language of religious imagination, is therefore abundant in reports of miracles." GRANT, *Miracle and Natural Law*, p. 268, considers this solution of Kroner's: "the solution which we find most satisfactory." See also the argument propounded by RAMSAY, *Miracles*. There are various languages: "each with its own logic (or meta-logic)" (p. 13). A distinction must be made between God's "first-order activity" ("for whose description the logic of science is appropriate") and God's "second-order activity," which rather requires the "logic of history." The word "miracle" is therefore a word: "in the logic of (meta-physical) history, which is used to describe an event which witnesses to, and is an occasion of, a *personal, second-order* activity of God, of which we are in some basic and non-inferential sense directly aware. A miracle is an historical event which *a fortiori* demanding for its description 'personal activity,' needs also the description 'God'" (p. 20 f.).

forms part of ordinary history; it can be observed by everybody, whether an explanation can be given for it or not. But the fact that the "something" that happened there, then and in that way happened as a "*miracle*" can only be understood by faith. We are reminded here of what DODD says in his "History and the Gospel." DODD is alive to the religious nature of the Gospels, to their dogmatic aspect, to which many point, but he argues emphatically that it may not be forgotten that the Gospels, as "Christian documents," are also historical documents, "and it belongs to the specific character of Christianity that it is an historical religion. . . The Gospels profess to tell us what happened." Eternal God manifested Himself in history. When we speak here of history "as the field of the self-revealing activity of God, we are thinking not of bare occurrences, but of the rich concreteness of events." In the history of the Gospels it is a question of "occurrence plus meaning," of the ultimate purport, the eschatological moment.¹ What DODD says about history in the Gospels in general we may also say of the miracles of Jesus. The miracles are "occurrences;" they are intrahistorical, i.e. as functions of the Kingdom of God they concretely revealed salvation there, then and in that way — that is how they are *sui generis* — and *at the same time* they are suprahistorical, events, because as deeds of God they are signs of the eschatological action of God.

We are now coming to an essential part of our investigation. We have repeatedly called the miracle a salutary function of the Kingdom of God. Yet we stressed that this does not mean a function

¹ DODD, *History and the Gospel*. I. Christianity as an historical religion. Dodd concludes: "If now we accept the definition of history as consisting of events which are of the nature of occurrence *plus* meaning, we may describe the story of the Gospels as a narrative of events whose meaning is eschatological, that is to say, events in which is to be discerned the mighty act of the transcendent God which brings history to its fulfilment. There is, then, an historical and a supra-historical aspect of the Gospel-story" (p. 36) . . . As regards Jesus' healing miracles, Dodd comments: "The statement that Jesus wrought miraculous cures is embodied in the primitive kerygma (Ac. X. 38) . . . Whatever therefore we may make of any particular miracle-story, we are dealing with a tradition which, for better or worse, contained this kind of thing from the very beginning" (p. 97 f.). Cf. on this point also BURKILL's study, *The Notion of Miracle with Special Reference to St. Mark's Gospel*. At quite an early stage people believed in Jesus' miracles and there were charismata in the religious community. Burkill refers to Phil. 2 : 5 ff. The doctrine of: "the Messiah's humiliation presupposed the belief that Jesus possessed supernatural power which he exercised in the interest of human salvation and not for his own private ends." The "Novellen" — the author includes in his survey the *Formgeschichte* of Bultmann and Dibelius — were important to both the doctrine and the practice of the primitive Church.

and no more. For the act of salvation is at the same time a sign; it is a presage, a preview, of ultimate salvation. Here lies the kerygmatic meaning of miracle. VAN RULER has formulated the Kingdom of God "in the Biblical sense" as: "the ultimate and salvation-bearing dealings of God with this world."¹ The three elements contained in this formulation come to the fore in striking fashion in miracles: miracles are dealings of God; these dealings bring salvation here and now *and* extend to the end, as a result of which the function acquires the "form" of the sign. We likewise remarked that in miracles Creation and Future, *Urzeit* and *Endzeit* as it were "meet." For in both we find direct action of God with power, we find change and renovation. CRESPIY recalls what Col. 1:15, 16 says about Christ as "the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible." Jesus heals as Saviour and Creator. "The past and the present come together in Jesus Christ." Jesus "restores men for God."²

At several points in our investigation we have demonstrated that we have great objections to a symbolic or allegorical interpretation of the miracles of Jesus as a whole or of separate passages from the miracle stories. This search for a deeper and more comprehensive meaning in the miracles gives us again and again the impression that the searchers are engaged in projecting personal ideas and spiritual finds on the immense screen of religious imagination.

¹ VAN RULER, *op. cit.*, p. 40 . . . Cf. BERKOUWER, *De Voorzienigheid Gods*, p. 248 ff. According to Berkouwer the first category with which we come into contact in the miracles of the Bible is that: "of the new and the surprising in God's action." See Ex. 34:10. In this new element we are confronted with: "the mighty historical action of God in love and mercy. It is His deed, which cannot be inferred from this world or from Israel. God acts!"

² CRESPIY, *La Guérison par la Foi*. "La guérison regarde à la fois vers la création et vers le Règne final. Le passé et l'avenir convergent en Jésus-Christ. Aussi la guérison est-elle simultanément la preuve de la divinité essentielle du Christ et la preuve de sa messianité; elle a une signification à la fois historique et ontologique" (p. 18 f.). "A proprement parler, Jésus n'est pas médecin—même si, çà et là, nous le voyons imposer les mains ou fabriquer un emplâtre—il ne guérit pas en supprimant un agent pathogène; il opère une véritable création nouvelle, restitue un homme devant Dieu, annonçant et préfigurant par là une nouvelle phase des rapports entre Dieu et l'homme" (p. 42). In this connection we would refer to the comment by MENOUD, *La Signification du Miracle dans le Nouveau Testament*, p. 186: "La grandeur du miracle néo-testamentaire est d'ordre théologique et non phénoménale."

We therefore cannot share KRONER's favourable opinion of the allegorical interpretation.³

To sum up, we may say about the interconnection of history, miracles and faith — by history we mean here, as elsewhere in this chapter, the happening of miracles in particular — that faith forms the connection, the "bridge," between history and miracles. It may be asked what not only "history" but also "faith" means. We have said something about this in the Introduction. When I believe that the miracles of Jesus "really" happened, I do so because I believe in the "truth" of Jesus Christ Himself. And this truth is "revealed" to me in the testimony to Christ in the New Testament writings.

The miracle, as a direct deed of God, can be understood only in the directness of personal faith, i.e. not a faith in which a spasmodic attempt is still made to tie miracles to some immanent "explanation," but one which accepts them as "data," i.e. as absolutely omnipotent, loving and significant actions by God. The miracles of Jesus may therefore not be "taken into consideration," even if this is done in the most sympathetic fashion. They are among the vital parts of the Gospels, which may not be cut away. At the highest stage of thought on this matter one is faced with an alternative: to believe that Jesus performed feats *supra et contra naturam* or not to believe it.

It is possible that whilst the miracle stories were being cast in written form lesser or greater tinges of Gemeindetheologie crept in at places or legendary threads were woven through the material. It is possible; and in every new generation exegetes will feel themselves called upon to measure the tinges and trace the threads. But, whatever the results of all these investigations may be, as the fruits of personal brainwork they will always remain disputable.

Our investigation into the miraculous power of Jesus and the miracles performed by Him has revealed that the definition of the miracle which we gave at the end of the Introduction reproduces every facet. In His miracles as direct deeds Jesus revealed to mankind, with an intention, a new observable reality, which can only be fully understood by faith. In this new reality, outside and against the known laws of order and regularity in nature, He proclaimed His freedom, power and love as the Son and Lord sent by the Father.

³ KRONER, *op. cit.*, p. 43 f.: "The old so-called allegorical interpretation is often more adapted to its task and certainly more profound, because the same religious imagination which originally received and produced the content of the divine revelation is also at work in that kind of interpretation of it."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- M. ALBERTZ, Die Botschaft des Neuen Testamentes. I, 1, 1947; II, 1, 1954. Zollikon, Zürich.
- , Die synoptischen Streitgespräche. Ein Beitrag zur Formen-geschichte des Urchristentums. Berlin, 1921.
- W. C. ALLEN, The Gospel according to S. Matthew (The internat. critical Comm.) Third edition. Edinburgh, 1947.
- P. ALTHAUS, Das sogenannte Kerygma und der historische Jesus. (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 48. Band). Gütersloh, 1958.
- C. F. VON AMMON, Die Geschichte des Lebens Jesu, mit steter Rücksicht auf die vorhandenen Quellen. Leipzig, 1842.
- M. A. VAN ANDEL, Klassieke wondermiddelen. Gorinchem, 1928.
- APOSTOLICORUM. Patrum — Opera recensuerunt O. de Gebhardt, A. de Harnack, Th. Zahn. Lipsiae, 1920.
- APOSTOLISCHE. De — Vaders, vertaling uit de grondtekst met aantekeningen, door D. Franses. Hilversum, 1941.
- APULEIUS, Œuvres complètes d'Apulée, traduites en français par Victor Bétolaud. Paris, 1862.
- ARISTIDES, The Apology of Aristides on behalf of the christians with an Introduction and translation by J. RENDEL HARRIS (Texts and studies, edited by J. Armitage Robinson, vol. 1). Cambridge, 1891.
- ARNOBIUS, The seven books of Arnobius adversus Gentes, translated by A. Hamilton Bryce and H. Campbell. Edinburgh, 1871.
- L. ASCHOFF, Über die Stellung der Naturwissenschaft zur Religion. (Zeitwende, Monatschrift, III Jahrgang). München, 1927.
- ATHANASIUS, Opera quae reperiuntur omnia, editio nova iuxta Parisinam anni M D C X X V I adornata, Graec. Lat. Coloniae, 1686.
- ATHENAEUS, The Deipnosophists with an English translation by Charles Burton Gulick. London, 1927.
- J. B. AUFHAUSER, Antike Jesus-Zeugnisse (Kl. Texte, herausgegeben von H. Lietzmann, 126). Bonn, 1925.
- , Buddha und Jesus in ihren Paralleltexen. Bonn, 1926.
- AUGUSTINUS, S. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi operum. Opera et studio monachorum ordinis S. Benedicti e congregatione S. Mauri. Parisiis, 1685.
- M. AVI-YONAH, Geschichte der Juden im Zeitalter des Talmud in den Tagen von Rom und Byzanz (Studia Judaica, Band II). Berlin, 1962.
- TH. P. VAN BAAREN, Wij mensen. Religie en wereldbeschouwing bij schriftloze volken. Utrecht, 1960.
- , Van maansikkel tot rijzende zon. De grote godsdiensten van Azië. Zeist, 1960.
- J. N. BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK en J. LINDEBOOM, Handboek der Kerkgeschiedenis I, derde herziene druk; II, tweede druk. 's-Gravenhage, 1946.
- TH. BALLAUFF, Das Problem des Lebendigen. Eine Übersicht über den Stand der Forschung. Bonn, 1949.
- C. K. BARRETT, The Gospel according to St. John. London, 1955.
- F. BARTH, Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu, 5e Auflage. Gütersloh, 1918.
- K. BARTH, Die Kirchliche Dogmatik. Zollikon-Zürich, 1947-1959.
- H. W. BARTSCH (Herausg.), Kerygma und Mythos I (1951); II (1952). Hamburg-Volksdorf.
- , Das Historische Problem des Lebens Jesu (Theologische Existenz heute. Neue Folge Nr. 78). München, 1960.

- K. BASCHWITZ, *De strijd met de duivel. De heksenprocessen in het licht der massa-psychologie*. Amsterdam, 1948.
- L. BAUER, *Volksleben im Lande der Bibel*. Leipzig, 1903.
- W. BAUER, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*. Tübingen, 1909.
- , *Das Johannesevangelium (HzNT)*. 3e verbess. und vermehrte Auflage. Tübingen, 1933.
- , *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. 3e, völlig neu bearbeitete Aufl. Berlin, 1937.
- O. BAUERNFEIND, *Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium*. Stuttgart, 1927.
- E. D. BAUMANN, *Psyche's lijden. Studiën over de ziekten der ziel in de oudheid*. Rotterdam, 1927.
- H. BAVINCK, *Gereformeerde Dogmatiek. Derde onveranderde uitgave*. Kampen, 1918.
- H. BAVINK, *Das Weltbild der heutigen Naturwissenschaften und seine Beziehungen zu Philosophie und Religion*, 2e durchgesehene Auflage. Iserlohn, 1952.
- M. A. BEEK, *Inleiding in de Joodse Apocalyptiek van het Oud- en Nieuw-Testamentisch Tijdvak (Theologia VI)*. Haarlem, 1950.
- G. BEER (mit einem Beitrag von K. Galling). *Exodus (Handbuch zAT, erste Reihe, 3)*. Tübingen, 1939.
- J. A. BENDEL, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*. Ed. tertia. Tübingen, 1835/36.
- A. BERENDTS en K. GRAS, *Flavius Josephus vom jüdischen Kriege Buch I-IV nach der slavischen Übersetzung Deutsch herausgegeben. (Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Dorpatensis (Tartuensis) B. V, 1924; B. IX, 1926)*.
- J. H. VAN DEN BERG, *Metabologica of Leer der veranderingen. Derde druk*. Nijkerk, 1957.
- G. A. VAN DEN BERGH VAN EYSINGA, *Indische invloeden op oude christelijke verhalen*. Leiden, 1901.
- , *Die holländische radicale Kritik des neuen Testamentes*. Jena, 1912.
- , *Voorchristelijk Christendom*. Zeist, 1918.
- , *Verklaring van het evangelie naar Mattheus*. Arnhem, 1947.
- S. F. H. J. BERKELBACH VAN DER SPENKEL, *Vrees en Religie. Een psychologisch onderzoek toegepast op Nieuw-Testamentische gegevens*. Utrecht.
- , *Het evangelie van Markus*. Amsterdam, 1937.
- G. C. BERKOUWER, *De voorzienigheid Gods (Dogmatische studiën)*. Kampen, 1950.
- , *De Persoon van Christus (Dogmatische Studiën)*. Kampen, 1952.
- , *Het werk van Christus (Dogmatische Studiën)*. Kampen, 1953.
- J. H. BERNARD, *St. John (Int. crit. Comm.)*. Edinburgh, 1953.
- A. BERTHOLET, (mit einem Beitrag von K. Galling), *Hesekiel (Handbuch zAT)*. Tübingen, 1936.
- E. W. BETH, *Natuurphilosophie*. Gorinchem, 1948.
- H. D. BETZ, *Lukian von Samosata und das Neue Testament. Religionsgeschichtliche und Paränetische Parallelen. (Texte und Untersuchungen, 76. Band = V. Reihe, Band 21)*. Berlin, 1961.
- O. BETZ, *Jesu heiliger Krieg (Novum Testamentum, Vol. II, Fasc. 2, 1957, S. 116-137)*.
- CH. DE BEUS, *De oud-Christelijke Doop en zijn Voorgeschiedenis I*. Haarlem, 1945.
- , *Jezus en de Wet*. Amsterdam, 1953.
- L. BIELER, *ΘΕΙΟΣ ΑΝΗΡ. Das Bild des „göttlichen Menschen“ in Spät-antike und Frühchristentum*. Wien, 1935-36.
- E. F. BISHOP, *Jesus of Palestine: The local background to the Gospel Documents. Second impression*. London, 1956.

- F. BLASS-A. DEBRUNNER, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Göttingen, 1943.
- L. BLAU, *Das altjüdische Zauberwesen*. Berlin, 1914.
- C. J. BLEEKER, *Het Christendom en de godsdiensten der aarde*. Assen, 1940.
- , *De phaenomenologie van de Heilandsfiguur* (in „Christologische Studiën” door C. J. Bleeker e.a.). Amsterdam, 1943.
- , *Op zoek naar het geheim van de Godsdienst. Inleiding tot de Godsdienstwetenschap*. Amsterdam, 1952.
- , *De Structuur van de Godsdienst. Hoofdpijnen ener Fenomenologie van de Godsdienst*. 's-Gravenhage, 1956.
- H. BLESS, *Pastoraal Psychiatrie*. Roermond, Maaseik, 1935.
- J. BLINZLER, *Der Prozess Jesu*. Dritte, stark erweiterte Auflage. Regensburg, 1960.
- M. BLOCH, *Les Rois Thaumaturges. Étude sur le caractère surnaturel attribué à la puissance royale particulièrement en France et en Angleterre*. Strassbourg, Paris, 1924.
- J. C. BLUMHARDT, *Ausgewählte Schriften in drei Bänden. Band I, Schriftauslegung*. Zürich, 1947.
- F. S. BODENHEIMER, *Animal and Man in Bible Lands* (Collection de travaux de l'Académie Internationale d'Histoire des Sciences. No. 10). Leiden, 1960.
- P. A. H. DE BOER, *De Voorbede in het Oude Testament*. (Oud-Testamentische Studiën, deel III). Leiden, 1943.
- C. W. DU BOEUFF en P. C. KUIPER, *Psycho-therapie en Zielzorg*. Utrecht, 1950.
- E. M. TH. BÖHL, *Genesis (Tekst en Uitleg)*. Dl. I. 2e druk, 1930. Dl. II, 1925. Groningen, Den Haag.
- M. E. BOISMARD, *Du Baptême à Cana (Jean I, 19-2, 11). Lectio Divina 18*. Paris, 1956.
- J. BONSIRVEN, *Les Juifs et Jésus. Attitudes nouvelles*. Paris, 1937.
- G. BORNKAMM, *Jesus von Nazareth*. Zweite Auflage. Stuttgart, 1957.
- , G. BARTH, H. J. HELD, *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium* (Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum A. und N. Testament, herausgegeben von G. Bornkamm u. G. von Rad, 1er Band). Neukirchener Verlag, 1960.
- K. BORNHÄUSER, *Das Wirken des Christus durch Taten und Worte* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, 2e Reihe 2e band). Gütersloh, 1921.
- , *Studien zum Sondergut des Lukas*. Gütersloh, 1934.
- W. BRANDT, *Das Ewige Wort, eine Einführung in das Evangelium nach Johannes* (4e Abteil. von Die Urchristl. Botschaft). Berlin, 1936.
- H. A. BRONGERS, *Enkele opmerkingen over het verband tussen zonde en ziekte enerzijds en vergeving en genezing anderzijds, in het Oude Testament* (Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift, 6e jaargang, afl. 3, februari 1952, pp. 129-142). Wageningen.
- C. H. BROOKS en E. CHARLES, *De genezingen van Emile Coué en de wonderen van Jezus* (vertaling van A. Kerdijk). Amsterdam, 1923.
- A. M. BROUWER, *De Bergrede*. Zeist, 1930.
- , *Jezus en de sociale vragen*. Zutphen, 1933.
- , *Het Nieuwe Testament vertaald en van aantekeningen voorzien*. Leiden, 1938.
- E. BRUNNER, *Der Mittler. Zur Besinnung über den Christusglauben*. 2e Aufl. Tübingen, 1930.
- , *Offenbarung und Vernunft. Die Lehre von der christlichen Glaubenserkenntnis*. Zürich, 1941.
- F. BÜCHSEL, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Gütersloh, 1935.

- , Das Evangelium nach Johannes (Das NTD I, 2). Göttingen, 1937.
- R. BULTMANN, Jesus. Berlin, 1929.
- , Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen. Zürich, 1949.
- , Theologie des neuen Testaments. Zweite, durchgesehene Auflage. Tübingen, 1954.
- , Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition. 3 durchgesehene Auflage mit Ergänzungsheft (1958). Göttingen, 1957.
- , Das Evangelium des Johannes (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament) 12. Auflage. Göttingen, 1952.
- , Glauben und Verstehen. Gesammelte Aufsätze. I. Tübingen, 1933.
- , History and Eschatology. Edinburgh, 1957.
- , H. VON SODEN, H. FRICK, Krisis des Glaubens. Krisis der Kirche. Krisis der Religion. Giessen, 1931.
- J. M. BURGERS, Trekken van de moderne westerse wetenschap. (Mededelingen der Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde, nieuwe reeks, deel 7, No. 5). Amsterdam, 1944.
- T. ALEC BURKILL, The notion of miracle with special reference to St. Mark's Gospel (Zeitschr. f. d. neutestam. Wissenschaft, 1-2, 1959).
- H. VAN DEN BUSSCHE, Het boek der tekens. Verklaring van Johannes 1-4. (Reeks woord en beleving. Het vierde Evangelie (I). Tiel, Den Haag, 1961.
- , Het boek der werken. Verklaring van Johannes 5-12. (Het vierde Evangelie (2). Tiel, Den Haag, 1960.
- W. H. CADMAN, The Raising of Lazarus (John 10,40-11,53). (Studia Evangelica, pp. 423-434. Texte u. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. 73. Band = V. Reihe, Band 18). Berlin, 1959.
- D. S. CAIRNS, The faith that rebels. A Re-examination of the miracles of Jesus. 3e ed. London, 1929.
- CALVIN, Joannis Calvini Institutionum Christianae Religionis Libri quatuor. Editio postrema. Amstelodami, 1667.
- , Joannis Calvini Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas. Amstelodami, 1667.
- JOH. CALVIJN, De Evangelien van Mattheüs, Markus en Lukas. Vertal. onder toezicht van A. Brummelkamp. Kampen, 1868-1871.
- , Uitlegging op de Evangelist Johannes. Uitgave van H. Franssen. Utrecht, 1890.
- T. CANAAN, Aberglaube und Volksmedizin im Lande der Bibel. (Abhandlungen des Hamburgischen Kolonialinstituts, Band XX). Hamburg, 1914.
- , Dämonenglaube im Lande der Bibel (Morgenland, Darstellungen aus Geschichte und Kultur des Ostens, Heft 21). Leipzig, 1929.
- D. CARADOG JONES, Spiritual Healing. An objective study of a perennial grace. London, 1955.
- W. L. L. CAROL, Leerboek der huidziekten. 2e herz. druk. Amsterdam, 1948.
- A. CARREL, L'Homme, cet Inconnu. Paris, 1935.
- A. CASTIGLIONI, A History of Medicine. Translated from the Italian and ed. by E. B. Krumbhaar. 2e ed. New York, 1947.
- H. P. CHAJES, Markus-Studien. Berlin, 1899.
- P. CLAUSING, De mens in de knoop. Leiden 1953.
- H. CLAVIER, Les sens multiples dans le Nouveau Testament (Novum Testamentum, Vol. II, Fasc. 3-4, 1958, p. 185-198).
- H. CLAVIER, La Multiplication des pains dans le Ministère de Jésus (Studia Evangelica, pp. 441-457, Texte u. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. 73. Band = V. Reihe, Band 18). Berlin, 1959.
- C. CLEMEN, Der Einfluss der Mysterienreligionen auf das älteste Christentum. Giessen, 1913.

- , Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments. Giessen, 1909.
- , Die Reste der primitiven Religion im ältesten Christentum. Bonn, 1916.
- CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS, Aanmaning aan de Grieken. Bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom (Oud-christelijke Geschriften VIII). Leiden, 1913.
- , Vlechtwerken. Bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom (Oud-christel. Geschriften XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, XVII, XVIII, XIX). Leiden, 1914-1915.
- , Opera quae extant. Recognita et illustrata per Joannem Potterum. Oxonii, 1715.
- A. L. CONSTANDSE, Grondslagen van het Atheïsme. Rotterdam, 1926.
- H. CONZELMANN, Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie des Lukas (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, 17). 4., verbesserte und ergänzte Auflage. Tübingen, 1962.
- W. J. COUPER, The Jew and Jesus. Hebrew Christian Testimony to Israel. London, 1925.
- G. CRESPY, La guérison par la foi (Cahiers Théologiques 30). Neuchâtel, 1952.
- O. CULLMANN, Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments. Tübingen, 1957.
- , Christus und die Zeit. Die urchristliche Zeit- und Geschichtsauffassung. 2 Auflage. Zollikon-Zürich, 1948.
- , Urchristentum und Gottesdienst (Abhandlungen zur Theologie des A. u. N. Testaments, 3). Basel, 1944.
- , Peter, Disciple, Apostle, Martyr. (transl. by Floyd V. Filson). New York, 1958.
- E. L. CURTIS and A. A. MADSEN, The Books of Chronicles (The Internat. Critical Comm.) Edinburgh, 1910.
- CYPRIANUS, S. Caecilii Cypriani opera. Recognita et illustrata a Joanne Fello. Oxonii, 1700.
- CYRILLUS, Cyrilli Hierosolymorum Archiepiscopi, Opera quae supersunt omnia illustravit Guilielmus Carolus Reischl. Monaci, 1848.
- G. DALMAN, Orte und Wege Jesu. 3. erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage. Gütersloh, 1924.
- , Jerusalem und sein Gelände. Gütersloh, 1930.
- , Die Worte Jesu. Band I, zweite Auflage. Leipzig, 1930.
- F. LE DANTEC, L'Athéisme. Paris, 1907.
- W. D. DAVIES and D. DAUBE, The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. Ed. by W. D. Davies and D. Daube in honour of C. H. Dodd. Cambridge, 1956.
- G. DEHN, Der Gottessohn (Die Urchristl. Botschaft, Abt. 2, Markusevangelium. Herausg. von O. Schmitz). 4e Aufl. Berlin.
- A. DEISSMANN, Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt. 4e völl. Neubearb. Aufl. Tübingen, 1923.
- G. DELLING, Josephus und das Wunderbare (Novum Testamentum, Vol. II, Fasc. 3-4, 1958, S. 291-309).
- W. DENNERT (Hrsg.), Die Natur des Wunder Gottes im Lichte der modernen Forschung. Unter Mitarbeit zahlreicher Naturwissenschaftler. 6., neu bearbeitete und erweiterte Aufl. Bonn, 1957.
- J. DUNCAN M. DERRETT, Peter's Penny: Fresh Light on Matthew XVII 24-7 (Novum Testamentum, Vol. VI, Januari 1963, Fasc. I, pp. 1-15).
- M. DIBELIUS, Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. 2e Neubearbeitete Aufl. Tübingen, 1933.
- , Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur. Berlin, Leipzig, 1926.
- H. DIEM, Der irdische Jesus und der Christus des Glaubens. Tübingen, 1957.
- J. H. DIEMER, Natuur en Wonder (Philosophia Reformata 1943-1945). Kampen.

- P. A. DIETZ, *Verschijsningen en verschijsnelsen. Een studie van het physische mediumschap*. Leiden, 1948.
- DIODORUS SICULUS, with an English translation by C. H. Oldfather and Ch. Lawton a.o. London etc., 1950 —.
- C. H. DODD, *History and the Gospel*. London, 1952.
- , *The interpretation of the fourth Gospel*. Cambridge, 1953.
- J. W. DOEVE, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Assen, 1953.
- T. DOKTER, *Het mythologische, het theoretische en het bijbelse wereldbeeld*. 's-Gravenhage, 1951.
- H. DOLCH, *Theologie und Physik (III. Naturphilosophische Beiträge)*. Freiburg, 1951.
- A. B. DRACHMANN, *Atheism in pagan Antiquity*. London, Copenhagen, Christiania, 1922.
- A. DREWS, *Die Christusmythe. Verbesserte und erweiterte Ausgabe*. Jena, 1910.
- H. DRIESCH, *Parapsychologie. Die Wissenschaft von den „okkulten“ Erscheinungen*. Zürich, 1943.
- H. J. W. DROOGLEEVER FORTUYN, *Kwakzalverij, bijgeloof en geneeskunst*. 2de druk. Leiden, 1949.
- H. DUHM, *Die bösen Geister im Alten Testament*. Tübingen, Leipzig, 1904.
- G. DUMAS, *Le Surnaturel et les Dieux, d'après les maladies mentales (Essai de Théogénie pathologique)*. Paris, 1946.
- E. J. DIJKSTERHUIS, *De mechanisering van het wereldbeeld*. Amsterdam, 1950.
- , *Christendom en Natuurwetenschap. Over hun betrekkingen in de loop der eeuwen*. (Ned. Theologisch Tijdschrift, 12e jaargang, Aflev. 5, juni 1958, pp. 321-342).
- B. S. EASTON, *Christ in the Gospels*. New York, London, 1930.
- W. EBSTEIN, *Die Medizin im Neuen Testament und im Talmud*. Stuttgart, 1903.
- M. BAKER EDDY, *Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures*. Boston, 1939.
- E. J. EDELSTEIN and L. EDELSTEIN, *Asclepius. A collection and interpretation of the Testimonies*. Publications of the Institute of the History of Medicine The Johns Hopkins University. Baltimore, 1945.
- A. EDERSEIM, *The life and times of Jesus the Messiah*. London, New York, 1931.
- B. D. EERDMANS, *The Religion of Israel*. Leiden, 1947.
- R. EISLER, *Iesus basileus ou basileusas. I (1929) II (1930)*. Heidelberg.
- S. EITREM, *Some notes on the demonology in the New Testament (Symbolae Osloenses Fasc. supplet. XII)*. Osloae, 1950.
- L. ELAUT, *Antieke Geneeskunde. In teksten van Griekse en Latijnse auteurs vanaf Homeros tot het begin van de Middeleeuwen*. Antwerpen, Amsterdam, 1960.
- P. A. ELDERENBOSCH, *De oplegging der handen*. 's-Gravenhage, 1953.
- M. ELIADE, *Images et symboles. Essais sur le symbolisme magico-religieux*. Paris, 1952.
- F. TH. ELWORTHY, *The Evil Eye. An account of this ancient & widespread superstition*. London, 1895.
- M. J. ELZINGA, *Geloof en geneeskunde*. Franeker.
- ENCYCLOPEDIA, *THE JEWISH* —. New York, London, 1901-1906.
- ENCYCLOPAEDIA JUDAICA. *Das Judentum in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Berlin, 1928 —.
- ENCYCLOPÉDIE, WINKLER PRINS —. Zesde druk. Amsterdam, Brussel, 1947-1954.
- EPIPHANIUS, *Opera omnia recensuit Dionysius Petavius Aurelianusensis. Editio nova*. Coloniae, 1682.
- E. ESKING, *Glaube und Geschichte in der theologischen Exegese* Ernst Lohmeyers.

- Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der neutestamentlichen Interpretation (*Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis XVIII*). Uppsala, 1951.
- A. A. M. ESSER, *Das Antlitz der Blindheit in der Antike. Eine Medizinisch-Kulturhistorische Studie*. Stuttgart, 1939.
- EURIPIDES, *Bakchai*. Ed. N. Wecklein, Leipzig, 1879.
- EUSEBIUS, *Kerkelijke geschiedenis. Ingeleid en vertaald door D. Franses*. Bussum, 1946.
- EXPOSITOR'S. *The — Greek Testament* edited by W. ROBERTSON NICOLL. Franeker. H. FABER, *Over ziek zijn*. Assen, 1956.
- E. FASCHER, *Prophetes. Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Giessen, 1927.
- , *Vom Verstehen des Neuen Testamentes. Ein Beitrag zur Grundlegung einer zeitgemässen Hermeneutik*. Giessen, 1930.
- F. FENNER, *Die Krankheit im Neuen Testament. Eine Religions- und Medizin-geschichtliche Untersuchung (Untersuchungen zum N. T., herausgegeben von H. Windisch, Heft 18)*. Leipzig, 1930.
- P. FIEBIG, *Antike Wundergeschichten zum Studium der Wunder des Neuen Testamentes*. Bonn, 1911.
- , *Jüdische Wundergeschichten des neutestamentlichen Zeitalters unter besonderer Berücksichtigung ihres Verhältnisses zum Neuen Testament*. Tübingen, 1911.
- W. FIEDLER, *Antiker Wetterzauber. Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft, Heft I*. Stuttgart, 1931.
- L.-CL. FILLION, *Les miracles de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ*. Paris, I, 1909; II, 1910.
- CH. FLANDIN, H. RABEAU, A. BASSET, *La Lèpre (Tome II (1948), p. 333-379, Traité de Médecine, secrétaires généraux A. Ravina et J. Patel)*. Paris.
- FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS, *Flavii Josephi De bello Judaico et Antiquitatum Judaicarum*. Sigebertus Havercampus, Amstelodami, 1726.
- E. FLEG, *Jésus raconté par le Juif errant*. Paris, 1953.
- V. E. FRANKL, *Homo patiens. Versuch einer Pathodizee*. Wien, 1950.
- J. G. FRAZER, *The golden Bough. A study in magic and religion*. Third edition. London, 1955.
- S. FREUD, *Totem und Tabu. Einige Übereinstimmungen im Seelenleben der Wilden und der Neurotiker*. Frankfurt/M., Hamburg, 1956.
- , *Vorlesungen zur Einführung in die Psycho-analyse*. Berlin, 1933.
- A. FRIDRICHSEN, *Le problème du miracle dans le Christianisme primitif*. Strassbourg, Paris, 1925.
- G. FRIEDRICH (Herausg.) *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (begründet von Gerh. Kittel)*. Stuttgart, 1933 — (TWNT).
- E. FROST, *Christian Healing. A consideration of the place of spiritual healing in the church of to-day in the light of the doctrine and practice of the Ante-Nicene Church*. Third impression. London, 1954.
- D. A. FRÖVIG, *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu als Lehrer und Wundertäter, nach Markus und der sogenannten Redequelle untersucht*. Leipzig, 1918.
- K. GALLING, *Biblisches Real-Lexikon (Handbuch zAT, erste Reihe, 1)*. Tübingen, 1937.
- GEBEDSGENEZING. *Vragen rondom de —. Rapport samengesteld door de Hervormde Raad voor Kerk en Ziekenzorg en aanvaard door de Generale Synode van de Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk*. 's-Gravenhage, 1959.
- J. GEBSER, *Abendländische Wandlung. Abriss der Ergebnisse moderner Forschung in Physik, Biologie und Psychologie. Ihre Bedeutung für Gegenwart und Zukunft*. 2e Auflage. Zürich, New York, 1945.

- F. GILS, *Jésus Prophète d'après les Évangiles Synoptiques* (Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia II). Louvain, 1957.
- W. H. GISPEN, *Het Boek Leviticus* (Commentaar op het Oude Testament). Kampen, 1950.
- H. GÖDAN, *Christus und Hippokrates. Gemeinsame Zentralprobleme in Medizin und Theologie*. Stuttgart, 1958.
- F. GODET, *Commentaar op het Evangelie van Lukas*. Naar de 3e druk uit het Frans vertaald. Utrecht.
- W. GOEZ, *Naturwissenschaft und Evangelium*. Heidelberg, 1954.
- F. GOGARTEN, *Die Verkündigung Jesu Christi. Grundlagen und Aufgabe*. Heidelberg, 1948.
- M. GOGUEL, *Das Leben Jesu* (vert. van „La Vie de Jésus” door Rob. Binswanger). Zürich, Leipzig, Stuttgart, 1934.
- M. GOLDSTEIN, *Jesus in the Jewish Tradition*. New York, 1950.
- E. J. GOODSPEED, *A Life of Jesus*, New York, 1956.
- L. GOPPELT, *Typos. Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen*. (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. 2. Reihe, 43. Band). Gütersloh, 1939.
- , *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie. 2. Reihe, 55. Band). Gütersloh, 1954.
- CH. GORE, H. L. GOUDGE, A. GUILLAUME, *A new Commentary on Holy Scripture including the Apocrypha*. London, 1929.
- E. P. GOULD, *The Gospel according to St. Mark* (The Intern. Critical Commentary) 7e impress. Edinburgh, 1932.
- R. M. GRANT, *Miracle and natural Law in Graeco-Roman and early christian Thought*. Amsterdam, 1952.
- J. GREBER, *Der Verkehr mit der Geisterwelt. Seine Gesetze und sein Zweck. Selbsterlebnisse eines katholischen Geistlichen*. Zweite Auflage. New York, 1937.
- H. GRESSMANN, *Der Messias*. Göttingen, 1929.
- S. GREYDANUS, *Het heilig evangelie naar de beschrijving van Lucas* (Kommentaar op het N. Test., deel III). Amsterdam, 1940.
- L. H. GROLENBERG en A. VAN DEURSEN, *Atlas van de Bijbel*. Amsterdam, Brussel, 1955.
- L. H. GRONDIJS, *De Iconographie van Schepping en Gods verschijningen*. Amsterdam, 1942.
- HUGO DE GROOT, *Hugonis Grotii Annotationes in libros Evangeliorum compendiatæ*.
- J. DE GROOT en A. R. HULST, *Macht en wil. De verkondiging van het Oude Testament aangaande God*. Nijkerk.
- F. W. GROSHEIDE, *Het heilig evangelie volgens Johannes* (Kommentaar op het N. Testament). Amsterdam, 1950.
- W. GRUNDMANN, *Der Begriff der Kraft in der neutestamentlichen Gedankenwelt*. (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom A. u. N. T., vierte Folge, Heft 8). Stuttgart, 1932.
- R. GUARDINI, *De Heer* (vertal. uit Duits „Der Herr” door Gabr. Smit). Utrecht, Brussel, 1947.
- CH. GUIGNEBERT, *The Jewish World in the time of Jesus* (translated from the French by S. H. Hooke). London, 1939.
- P. HÄBERLIN, *Das Wunderbare. Zwölf Betrachtungen über die Religion*. Zürich, 1930.
- H. W. HAGGARD, *Van Medicijnman tot Geneesheer* (vert. en bew. van: Devils, Drugs and Doctors, door W. Schuurmans Stekhoven). Amsterdam, 1951.
- TH. L. HAITJEMA, *Dogmatiek als Apologie*. (Theologia I). Haarlem, 1948.

- W. R. HALLIDAY, *The pagan background of early Christianity*. Liverpool, London, 1925.
- B. CHR. HAMER, *Zielszorg en psychiatrie*. Kampen, 1952.
- J. E. HANAUER, *Folklore of the Holy Land, Moslem, Christian and Jewish*. London, 1907.
- A. [VON] HARNACK, *Medizinisches aus der ältesten Kirchengeschichte (Texte und Untersuchungen VIII Band)*. Leipzig, 1892.
- , *Het wezen des Christendoms (vertal. van C. S. M. Kuenen)*. Leiden, 1903.
- , *Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. 2e verbess. u. vermehrte Auflage*. Leipzig, 1924.
- , *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*. Leipzig, 1915.
- , *Porphyrus, „Gegen die Christen“*, 15 Bücher, Zeugnisse, Fragmente und Referate. Berlin, 1916.
- G. HARTDORFF, *Historie of historisering? Een onderzoek naar de visie van G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga op de wordingsgeschiedenis van het Christendom*. Amsterdam, 1950.
- L. VAN HARTINGSVELD, *Die Eschatologie des Johannes-evangeliums. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit R. Bultmann*. Assen, 1962.
- M. HARTMANN, *Naturwissenschaft und Religion*. Jena, 1940.
- F. HAUCK, *Das Evangelium des Lukas (Theolog. Handkomm. zum N. Testament)*. Leipzig, 1934.
- , *Das Evangelium des Markus (Synoptiker I; Theol. Handkommentar z. N. Testam., II)*. Leipzig, 1931.
- A. C. HEADLAM, *The miracles of the New Testament*. London, 1914.
- G. J. HEERING, *De verwachting van het Koninkrijk Gods*. Arnhem, 1952.
- J. L. HEIBERG, *Naturwissenschaften und Mathematik im klassischen Altertum*. Leipzig, 1912.
- F. HEILER, *Das Gebet. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und religionspsychologische Untersuchung*. 4e Auflage. München, 1921.
- K. HEIM, *Der Christliche Gottesglaube und die Naturwissenschaft*. Hamburg, 1953.
- , *Zur Frage der Wunderheilungen (Zeitwende, Monatschrift, III Jahrgang)*. München, 1927.
- W. HEISENBERG, *Wandlungen in den Grundlagen der Naturwissenschaft. 8e erweiterte Auflage*. Zürich, 1949.
- W. HEISENBERG, *Das Naturbild in der heutigen Physik*. Hamburg, 1956.
- G. J. HELD, *Magie, Hekserij en Toverij*. Groningen, Djakarta, 1950.
- J. HEMPEL, *Heilung als Symbol und Wirklichkeit im Biblischen Schrifttum (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. I Philol.-Histor. Klasse. Jahrgang 1958, No. 3)*.
- E. HENNECKE, (herausgegeben von —) *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen. Zweite Auflage*. Tübingen, 1924.
- H. HEPPE, *Die Dogmatik der Evangelisch-Reformierten Kirche*. 1935.
- W. HERBERG, *Judaism and modern Man. An Interpretation of Jewish Religion*. New York, Philadelphia, 1959.
- J. G. HERDER, *Vom Erlöser der Menschen. Nach unsern drei ersten Evangelien*. Riga, 1796.
- , *Von Gottes Sohn, der Weltheiland. Nach Johannes Evangelium. Nebst einer Regel der Zusammenstimmung unsrer Evangelien aus ihrer Entstehung und Ordnung*. Riga, 1797. (Herders Sämtliche Werke, herausgegeben von B. Suphan. Neunzehnter Band. Berlin, 1880).
- R. TRAVERS HERFORD, *Christianity in Talmud and Midrash*. London, 1903.

- HERODOTUS, *Historiarum Libri IX*. Ed. H. Kallenberg. Lipsiae, 1921.
- S. HERRLICH, *Antike Wunderkuren*. (Wissenschaftl. Beilage zum Jahresbericht des Humboldt-Gymnasiums zu Berlin). Berlin, 1911.
- W. HERRMANN, *Offenbarung und Wunder*. Gieszen, 1908.
- R. HERZOG, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidauros*. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Religion (Philologus, Supplementsband XXII, Heft 3). Leipzig, 1931.
- J. J. HESZ, *Geschichte der drey letzten Lebensjahre Jesu*. Zweyter Band. Vierte durchaus verbesserte Auflage. Zürich, 1774.
- J. E. HEYDE, *Entwertung der Kausalität? Für und wider den Positivismus*. Stuttgart, 1957.
- K. A. H. HIDDING, *Mens en Godsdienst*. *Levende godsdiensten phaenomenologisch belicht*. Delft, 1954.
- HIPPOLYTUS, *Refutatio omnium haeresium* (Herausgegeben von der Kirchenväter-Commission der Königl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften) von P. Wendland. Leipzig, 1916.
- , *Weerlegging van alle ketterijen*. Bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom. (Oud-christel. Geschriften XXIII en XXIV). Leiden, 1916-1917.
- H. HOFFMANN, *Die Frage nach dem Wesen des Christentums in der Aufklärungstheologie*. (Harnack-Ehrung). Leipzig, 1921.
- J. G. H. HOFFMANN, *Les Vies de Jésus et le Jésus de l'histoire*. Étude de la valeur historique des Vies de Jésus de langue française, non catholiques, d'Ernest Renan à Charles Guignebert (*Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis XVII*). Paris, 1947.
- F. HOLMSTRÖM, *Das eschatologische Denken der Gegenwart*. Gütersloh, 1936.
- G. HÖLSCHER, *Das Buch Hiob* (Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Erste Reihe 17). Zweite Auflage. Tübingen, 1952.
- R. HOOYKAAS, *Natural Law and Divine Miracle*. A historical-critical study of the principle of Uniformity in Geology, Biology and Theology. Leiden, 1959.
- HORACE, *The Odes and Epodes*. With an English Translation by C. E. Bennett. London etc., 1952.
- A. VAN HOVE, *La Doctrine du Miracle chez Saint Thomas*. Wetteren, Bruges, Paris, 1927.
- E. HOWARD COBB, *Christus de Geneesheer* (vertaling van: Christ Healing). Amsterdam, 1952.
- A. R. HULST, *Het karakter van de Cultus in Deuteronomium*. Wageningen, 1938.
- H. C. VAN DE HULST en C. A. VAN PEURSEN, *Phaenomenologie en Natuurwetenschap*. *Bezinning op het Wereldbeeld*. Utrecht, 1953.
- A. M. HUNTER, *The Work and Words of Jesus*. London, 1950.
- , *Interpreting the New Testament 1900-1950*. London, 1951.
- R. W. HUSBAND, *The Prosecution of Jesus*. Its Date, History and Legality. Princeton, 1916.
- B. M. F. VAN IERSEL, 'Der Sohn' in den synoptischen Jesusworten. Leiden, 1961.
- IRENAEUS, *Weerlegging en afwending der valselyk dusgenaamde wetenschap*. Bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom (Oud-christel. Geschriften XXVI, XXVII, XXVIII, XXIX, XXX). Leiden, 1918-1920.
- , *Quae supersunt omnia*, edidit Adolphus Stieren. Lipsiae, 1853.
- J. ISAAC, *Jésus et Israël*. Paris, 1948.
- IUSTINUS, *Apologie*, bewerkt door J. A. Cramer (Oud-christelijke Geschriften, V) Leiden, 1908.
- , *Opera quae exstant omnia et TATIANI, adversus Graecos oratio*. Opera et studio unius ex Monachis Congregationis S. Mauri. Hagae Comitum M D C C X L I I apud Petrum de Hondt.

- , *Samenspraak met de Jood Trypho*, bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom (Oud-christel. Geschriften XXV). Leiden, 1917.
- I. JAKOBOVITS, *Jewish medical Ethics. A comparative and historical study of the Jewish religious attitude to medicine and its practice*. New York, 1959.
- E. O. JAMES, *The Nature and function of Priesthood. A comparative and anthropological study*. London, 1955.
- P. JANET, *Les obsessions et la psychasthénie I. Troisième édition*. Paris, 1919.
- K. JASPERS, *Wijsgerig geloof* (oorspronkelijke titel: *Der philosophische Glaube*. Vertaling van J. C. van Dijk). Haarlem, 1950.
- H. JEANMAIRE, *Dionysos. Histoire du culte de Bacchus*. Paris, 1951.
- R. JELKE, *Die Wunder Jesu*. Leipzig-Erlangen.
- A. JEREMIAS, *Babylonisches im Neuen Testament*. Leipzig, 1905.
- JOACH. JEREMIAS, *Jesus als Weltvollender*. Gütersloh, 1930.
- A. JIRKU, *Die Dämonen und ihre Abwehr im Alten Testament*. Leipzig, 1912.
- J. JOCZ, *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ*. London, 1949.
- JOHANNES DAMASCENUS, *Joannis Damasceni opera omnia quae extant*. Graec. Latine. Opera et studio P. Michaelis Lequien. Editio novissima Veneta. Venetiis, 1748.
- N. JOHANSSON, *Parakletoi. Vorstellungen von Fürsprechern für die Menschen vor Gott in der alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Lund, 1940.
- G. O. JONES, J. ROTBLAT, G. J. WHITROW, *Atoms and the Universe*.
- M. JONES, *The New Testament in the twentieth century*. London, 1914.
- H. W. M. DE JONG, *Demonische ziekten in Babylon en Bijbel*. Leiden, 1959.
- J. M. DE JONG, *Kerygma. Een onderzoek naar de vooronderstellingen van de theologie van Rudolf Bultmann*. Assen, 1958.
- K. H. E. DE JONG, *Das antike Mysterienwesen. In religionsgeschichtlicher, ethnologischer und psychologischer Beleuchtung*. Leiden, 1909.
- , *Oosters-Hellenistische mysteriën*. 's-Gravenhage, 1948.
- M. DE JONGE, *Nieuwe bijdragen tot de Leben-Jesu-Forschung in Duitsland* (*Vox Theologica*, 29e Jaargang, no. 5, 1959. Blz. 129-144). Assen, 1959.
- H. J. JORDAN, *De causale verklaring van het leven. Haar invloed op het godsdienstig en wijsgerig denken*. 5e druk. Amsterdam, 1947.
- A. JÜNCKER, *Jesus und das Leid. Zeit- und Streitfragen des Glaubens, der Weltanschauung und Bibelforschung, Reihe XVI, Heft 2*. Berlin, Lichterfelde, 1925.
- G. KAFKA, *Naturgesetz, Freiheit und Wunder*. Paderborn, 1940.
- M. KÄHLER, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus*. (Theologische Bücherei. Band 2. Systematische Theologie). Neu herausgegeben von E. Wolf. 2e erweiterte Auflage. München, 1956.
- O. KAISER, *Die mythische Bedeutung des Meeres in Ägypten, Ugarit und Israel*. (Beihefte z. Zeitschrift für die alttestam. Wissenschaft 78). Berlin, 1959.
- IMM. KANT, *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*. Zweite, verm. Aufl. Königsberg, 1794.
- H. KAUPPEL, *Die Dämonen im alten Testament*. Augsburg, 1930.
- E. KAUTZSCH, (Hrsg.) *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. Neudruck. Tübingen, 1921.
- JOS. KEULERS, *Het Evangelie volgens Joannes* (De boeken van het Nieuwe Testament). Roermond, Maaseik, 1951.
- , *De Evangelien volgens Marcus en Lucas* (De boeken van het Nieuwe Testament). Roermond, Maaseik, 1951.
- , *Het Evangelie volgens Mattheüs* (De boeken van het Nieuwe Testament). Roermond, Maaseik, 1950.

- A. KIEFER, *Aretalogische Studien*, Leipzig, 1929.
- R. KITTEL, *Die Psalmen* (Kommentar z. A. T.). Leipzig, Erlangen, 1922.
- W. KLAAS, *Der moderne Mensch in der Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns* (Theolog. Studien, herausgegeben von Karl Barth, Heft 24). Zürich, 1947.
- J. KLAUSNER, *Jesus of Nazareth. His life, times, and teaching*. Translated by H. Danby. Third impression. London, 1947.
- , *From Jesus to Paul*. Translated by W. F. Stinespring. Second impression. London, 1946.
- J. KLOEK, *De verhouding van geloof en medische wetenschap*. (Verkenningen, o. red. van W. Aalders, H. v. d. Linde, E. v. d. Schoot). Utrecht, 1956.
- E. KLOSTERMANN, *Das Lukasevangelium* (Handbuch z. N. T., 5). 2e völlig neubearbeitete Aufl. Tübingen, 1929.
- , *Das Markusevangelium* (Handbuch z. N. T., 3) 3e neubearbeitete Aufl. Tübingen, 1936.
- , *Das Matthäusevangelium* (Handbuch z. N. T., 4). 3e photomechan. gedruckte Aufl. Tübingen, 1938.
- H. KLUIN, *Het Geestesleven der natuurliefen. 's-Gravenhage*, 1924.
- A. F. J. KLIJN, *Inleiding tot het Nieuwe Testament*. Utrecht, 1961.
- H. G. KOCH, *Abschaffung Gottes? Der materialistische Atheismus als heutige Existenzform*. Geschichte, Problematik, Widerlegung. Stuttgart, 1961.
- K. E. KOCH, *Seelsorge und Okkultismus. Eine praktisch-theologische und systematische Untersuchung unter Berücksichtigung der medizinischen und psychologischen Grenzwissenschaften*. Würstenrot, 1953.
- A. KOCKELMANS, *Phaenomenologie en Natuurwetenschap. Een Inleiding in de wijsbegeerte der natuurwetenschappen*. Haarlem, 1962.
- L. KOEHLER, *Das formgeschichtliche Problem des Neuen Testaments* (Sammlung gemeinverständl. Vorträge u. Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie u. Religionsgeschichte, 127), Tübingen, 1927.
- P. J. KOETS, *Deisidaimonia. A contribution to the knowledge of the religious terminology in Greek*. Purmerend, 1929.
- L. KÖHLER, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Tübingen, 1947.
- PH. KOHNSTAMM, *Schepper en Schepping III. De Heilige. Proeve van een christelijke geloofsleer voor deze tijd*. Haarlem, 1921.
- J. L. KOOLE, *Gaven der genezing* (Exegetica, eerste reeks, vijfde deel), Delft, 1953.
- C. KOPP, *Die heiligen Stätten der Evangelien*. Regensburg, 1959.
- F. W. A. KORFF, *Christologie. De Leer van het komen Gods*. 2e druk. Nijkerk, 1942.
- J. KOTY, *Die Behandlung der Alten und Kranken bei den Naturvölkern* (Forschungen zur Völkerpsychologie und Soziologie, herausgeg. v. R. Thurnwald, Band XIII). Stuttgart, 1934.
- R. KRONER, *The religious function of imagination*. New Haven, 1941.
- A. C. KRUYT, *Het animisme in den Indischen Archipel. 's-Gravenhage*, 1906.
- W. KUHAUPT, *Die okkulten Erscheinungen und das Wunderbare um die Person Jesu*. Aschneben, 1913.
- W. G. KÜMMEL, *Jesus und der jüdische Traditionsgehalte* (Zeitschrift für die neutestam. Wissenschaft, 1934).
- E. KÜSTER, *Die Schlange in der griechischen Kunst und Religion*. Giessen, 1913.
- LACTANTIUS, *Lucius Caecilius Firmianus Lactantius, Opera omnia* ed. Nicolaus Lenglet Dufresnoy. Parisiis, 1748.
- M. LAMBERECHTS, *Het nieuwe physische wereldbeeld. Een onderzoek naar het wezen van de stof in de huidige „Theoretische Physica“*. Brussel, 1944.
- E. LANGTON, *Essentials of Demonology. A study of Jewish and Christian Doctrine, its origin and development*. London, 1949.
- JAC. Z. LAUTERBACH, *Rabbinic Essays*. Cincinnati, 1951.

- C. A. DE LEEUW, *Aelius Aristides als bron voor de kennis van zijn tijd*. Amsterdam, 1939.
- G. VAN DER LEEUW, *Phaenomenologie der Religion*. Tübingen, 1933.
- e.a., *De Godsdiensten der wereld I en II*. Amsterdam, 1940.
- , *De Primitieve Mensch en de Religie*. Anthropologische studie. Ongewijzigde herdruk. Groningen, Djakarta, 1952.
- J. A. C. VAN LEEUWEN, *Het heilig evangelie naar de beschrijving van Markus* (Kommentaar op het N. Test.). Amsterdam, 1928.
- W. S. VAN LEEUWEN, *Eirene in het Nieuwe Testament*. Wageningen, 1940.
- H. LEISEGANG, *Die Gnosis*. 1924.
- LÉPICIER, *Le Miracle. Sa Nature, ses Lois, ses rapports avec l'ordre surnaturel* (traduit par C. Grolleau). Paris, 1936.
- E. LERLE, *Das Raumverständnis im Neuen Testament*. 2e Aufl. Stuttgart, 1955.
- C. S. LEWIS, *Miracles. A preliminary study*. London, 1952.
- E. LIEK, *Het Wonder in de Geneeskunde*; vert. door W. Schuurmans Stekhoven. Utrecht, 1931.
- R. H. LIGHTFOOT, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark*. Oxford, 1950.
- G. A. LINDEBOOM, *Inleiding tot de geschiedenis der geneeskunde*. Haarlem, 1961.
- G. LINDESKOG, *Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitlichen Judentum. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Leipzig, Uppsala, 1938.
- C. H. LINDYER, *Het lijden in het Nieuwe Testament*. Amsterdam, 1956.
- E. LOHMEYER, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*. (HzNT 16). Tübingen, 1926.
- H. VAN DER LOOS, *Jezus Messias-Koning. Een speciaal onderzoek naar de vraag of Jezus van Nazaret politieke bedoelingen heeft nagestreefd*. Assen, 1942.
- DE LOOSTEN, (Georg Lomer), *Jesus Christus vom Standpunkte des Psychiaters*. Bamberg, 1905.
- F. LÜBKERS, *Reallexikon des klassischen Altertums*. 8. vollständig umgearbeitete Aufl. (hrsg. von J. Geffcken u. E. Ziebarth). Leipzig, Berlin, 1914.
- LUCIAN's Werke. Deutsch von Theod. Fischer. Stuttgart, 1866.
- LUCIANUS, *Philopseudes* (uitgegeven door L. van Liempt). Zwolle, 1941.
- G. LUDWIG, *Das naturwissenschaftliche Weltbild des Christen* (Fromms Taschenbücher „Zeitnahes Christentum“, Band 16). Osnabrück, 1962.
- G. LUNDSTRÖM, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus. A History of Interpretation from the last decades of the nineteenth century to the present day*. Translated by Joan Bulman. Edinburgh and London, 1963.
- C. E. LUTHARDT, *Kompendium der Dogmatik*. 11e Aufl. bearbeitet von F. F. Winter. Leipzig, 1914.
- W. LUTZ, *Lehrbuch der Haut- und Geschlechtskrankheiten*. Basel, 1951.
- L. J. MC GINLEY, *Form-Criticism of the Synoptic healing-narratives. A study in the theories of Martin Dibelius and Rudolf Bultmann*. Woodstock College Press, 1944.
- J. MACKINNON, *The historic Jesus*, London, 1931.
- J. MAES, *Fetischen of tooverbeelden uit Kongo* (Annales du Musée du Congo Belge. Ethnographie Serie VI, Tome II, Fascicule 1). Bruxelles, 1935.
- J. MÁNEK, *Fishers of men* (Novum Testamentum, Vol. II, Fasc. 2, 1957, p. 138-141).
- T. W. MANSON, *The Teaching of Jesus. Studies of its form and content*. Cambridge, 1948.
- W. MANSON, *Jesus the Messiah*. London, 1944.
- W. MARXSEN, *Anfangsprobleme der Christologie*. Gütersloh, 1960.
- W. MARXSEN, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Eine Einführung in ihre Probleme*. Gütersloh, 1963.
- G. MASPERO, *Les contes populaires de l'Égypte ancienne*. Quatrième éd. entièrement remaniée et augmentée. Paris.

- H. M. MATTER, *Nieuwere opvattingen omtrent het Koninkrijk Gods in Jezus' prediking naar de Synoptici*. Kampen, 1942.
- F. MAUTHNER, *Der Atheismus und seine Geschichte im Abendlande*. I-IV, Stuttgart, Berlin, 1920-1923.
- R. MEAD, *Richardi Meadii Medica Sacra, sive de morbis Biblicis in signioribus commentariis*. Ed. nova correcta et notis locupletata. Lugduni Batav., 1787.
- A. G. M. VAN MELSEN, *Van atomos naar atoom. De geschiedenis van het begrip atoom*. Amsterdam, 1949.
- PH. H. MENOUD, *La signification du miracle dans le Nouveau Testament (Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses, XXVIII^e et XXIX^e Années, 1948-1949, n^o 3)* Paris.
- G. MENSCHING, *Das Wunder im Glauben und Aberglauben der Völker*. Leiden, 1957.
- R. MEYER, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa. Studie zum Jesusbild der drei ersten Evangelien*. Leipzig, 1940.
- W. MICHAELIS, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. Bern, 1946.
- E. R. MICKLEM, *Miracles and the new Psychology*. London, 1922.
- MIDRASH, *The — on Psalms*. Transl. by William G. Braude (Yale Judaica Series, Vol. XIII). New Haven, 1959.
- MIDRASH RABBAH. Ed. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon. London, 1939.
- S. VAN MIERLO, *La science, la raison et la foi (Bibliothèque de Philosophie contemporaine)*. Paris, 1948.
- MINUCIUS FELIX, *Octavius, recensuit Joannes Davisius*. Cantabrigiae, 1707.
- , *Octavius*. Bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom (Oud-Christel. Geschriften XLIV). Leiden, 1929.
- K. H. MISKOTTE, *Antwoord uit het onweer*. Amsterdam, 1935.
- , *Het wezen der Joodse Religie*. Amsterdam, 1933.
- J. MOFFATT, *The New Testament. A new Translation. Revised Edition*. London, 1934.
- L. MONDEN S.J. *Het wonder. Theologie en Apologetiek van het Christelijk mirakel*. Utrecht, 1958.
- C. C. MONTEFIORE, *What a Jew thinks about Jesus*. (The Hibbert Journal, vol. XXXIII, Oct. 1934-July 1935). London.
- J. MOREAU, *Les plus anciens témoignages profanes sur Jésus*. Bruxelles, 1944.
- M. C. VAN MOURIK BROEKMAN, *Para-psychologie en Godsdienstig leven (Para-psychol. Bibliotheek, deel IV)*. 's-Gravenhage, 1938.
- A. NEANDER, *Das Leben Jesu Christi, in seinem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange und seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. 4e verbess. Aufl. Hamburg, 1845.
- W. NESTLE, *Von Mythos zum Logos. Die Selbstentfaltung des griechischen Denkens von Homer bis auf die Sophistik und Sokrates*. Stuttgart, 1940.
- A. NEUBERG, *Das naturwissenschaftliche Weltbild der Gegenwart*. 4e Auflage. Göttingen, 1944.
- G. C. VAN NIFTRIK, *Kleine Dogmatiek*. 2e druk. Nijkerk, 1946.
- M. P. NILSSON, *Die Religion in den griechischen Zauberpapyri*. Lund, 1948.
- B. NOACK, *Satanás und Sotería. Untersuchungen zur neutestamentlichen Dämonologie*. København, 1948.
- F. A. NOLLE, *Arts en predikant. Een beschouwing over grenzen en raaklijnen van hun beider arbeidsterrein*. Utrecht, 1952.
- O. NOORDENBOS, *Het atheïsme in Nederland in de negentiende eeuw. Een kritisch overzicht*. Rotterdam, 1931.
- O. NOORDMANS, *Herscheping*. Zeist, 1934.
- H. TH. OBBINK, *Oostersch Leven*. Nijkerk, 1914.

- H. W. OBBINK, *De magische betekenis van de naam inzonderheid in het oude Egypte*. Amsterdam, 1925.
- T. K. OESTERREICH, *Die Besessenheit*. Langensalza, 1921.
- ORIGENES, *Over de beginnelen*. Bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom (*Oud-christel. Geschriften XXXI*). Leiden, 1921.
- , *Verweerschrift tegen Celsus*. Bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom, (*Oud-christel. Geschriften XXXIV, XXXV, XXXVI, XXXVII*). Leiden, 1924-1925.
- ORIGENIS, *Opera omnia*, ed. Caroli Delarue. Parisiis, 1733.
- R. OTTO, *Reich Gottes und Menschensohn. Ein religionsgeschichtlicher Versuch*. Zweite verbess. Auflage. München, 1940.
- W. OURSLER, *The healing power of Faith*. New York, 1957.
- B. J. H. OVINK, *De zekerheid der menselijke kennis*. Zutphen, 1928.
- J. L. PALACHE, *Inleiding in de Talmoed*. Tweede druk. Haarlem, 1954.
- H. E. G. PAULUS, *Exegetisches Handbuch über die drei ersten Evangelien*. Heidelberg, 1830-1833.
- , *Philologisch-kritischer und historischer Commentar über das neue Testament*. IV, 1. Lübeck, 1804.
- PAUSANIAS, *Description of Greece*. With an English translation by W. H. S. Jones and H. A. Ormerod. London etc., 1959.
- C. F. PAUWELS, *Apologetiek*. Roermond, Maaseik, 1948.
- , *Het Wonder*. Utrecht, 1940.
- J. PEDERSEN, *Israel, its Life and Culture I-II*; London, Copenhagen, 1926.
- O. PERELS, *Die Wunderüberlieferung der Synoptiker in ihrem Verhältnis zur Wortüberlieferung*. (Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom A. und N. Test., vierte Folge, Heft 12). Stuttgart, Berlin, 1934.
- J. PETERSEN, *Naturforschung und Glaube*, 2e Aufl. (*Religionsgesch. Volksbücher für die deutsche christliche Gegenwart V Reihe 3 Heft*). Tübingen, 1907.
- E. PETERSON, *Heis Theos. Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtl. Untersuchungen (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des A. und N. Test. Neue Folge, 24 Heft)*. Göttingen, 1926.
- R. PETTAZZONI, *The All-Knowing God. Researches into early Religion and Culture*. (Authorised Translation by H. J. Rose). London, 1956.
- PHILOSTRATORUM quae supersunt omnia, ed. Gottfridus Olearius; Lipsiae, 1709.
- PHILOSTRATOS, *Life and Times of Apollonius of Tyana*. Rendered into English from the Greek of Philostratus the Elder by Charles P. Eells (Stanford Univ. Publications. Language and Literature, Volume II). California, 1923.
- S. PICK, *Die auf Jesus gedeuteten Stellen des Alten Testaments*. Quellenstudien. Frankfurt am Main, 1923.
- J. PICKL, *Messias König Jesus in der Auffassung seiner Zeitgenossen*. 2e durchges. Auflage. München, 1935.
- H. PINKHOF, *Verstalend en verklarend woordenboek van uitheemse geneeskundige termen*. 4e verbeterde en vermeerde. druk, bewerkt door G. J. Schoute. Haarlem, 1954.
- M. PLANCK, *Religion und Naturwissenschaft*, 4e unveränd. Auflage. Leipzig, 1938.
- PLINY, *Natural History*. With an English translation by H. Rackham, W. H. S. Jones and D. E. Eichholz. London etc., 1947-1963.
- A. PLUMMER, *The Gospel according to S. Luke (The internat. critical comm.)* Fifth ed. Edinburgh, 1956.
- H. PREISKER, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*. Berlin, 1937.
- J. PREUSS, *Biblisch-talmudische Medizin. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Heilkunde und der Kultur überhaupt*. Berlin, 1911.

- L. RADERMACHER, Neutestamentliche Grammatik (Handb. z. N. T., 1) 2e erweiterte Aufl. Tübingen, 1925.
- I. T. RAMSAY, Miracles. An exercise in logical mapwork. Oxford, 1952.
- P. DE RÉGLA, Jésus de Nazareth. Au point de vue historique, scientifique et social. 2e éd. Paris, 1891.
- R. REITZENSTEIN, Hellenistische Wundererzählungen. Leipzig, 1906.
- , Poimandres. Leipzig, 1904.
- RELIGION. Die — in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Zweite, völlig Neubearb. Auflage. Hrsg. H. Gunkel und L. Zscharnack. Tübingen, 1927-1932.
- E. RENAN, Les Apôtres. Paris, 1866.
- , Vie de Jésus; 13e éd. Paris.
- K. H. RENGSTORF, Die Anfänge der Auseinandersetzung zwischen Christusglaube und Asklepiosfrömmigkeit. Münster Westf., 1953.
- und F. BÜCHSEL, Das Evangelium nach Lukas und das Evangelium nach Johannes (Das Neue Testament Deutsch I, 2, herausgegeben von P. Althaus und Joh. Behm). Göttingen, 1937.
- G. RÉVÉSZ e.a. Het persoonlijke en sociale leven van de blinden. Leiden, 1955.
- PH. REYMOND, L'eau, sa vie et sa signification dans l'Ancien Testament. Leiden, 1958.
- G. RICCIOTTI, Leven van Jezus. (vertal. van J. Simons). Utrecht, Brussel, 1949.
- A. RICHARDSON, The Miracle-stories of the Gospels. London, 1942.
- H. RIDDERBOS, De komst van het Koninkrijk. Jezus' prediking volgens de synoptische evangeliën. Kampen, 1950.
- , Paulus en Jezus. Oorsprong en algemeen karakter van Paulus' Christusprediking. Kampen, 1952.
- H. RISTOW und K. MATTHIAE (Herausg.), Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus. Beiträge zum Christusverständnis in Forschung und Verkündigung. Zweite Auflage. Berlin, 1961.
- W. H. R. RIVERS, Medicine, Magic and Religion. London, 1924.
- J. M. ROBERTSON, Christianity and Mythology. London, 1900.
- , Geschichte des Christentums (Übersetz. von H. L.) Frankfurt a.M., 1910.
- J. M. ROBINSON, A new quest of the historical Jesus. (Studies in Biblical Theology, N° 25). London, 1959.
- TH. H. ROBINSON und F. HORST, Die zwölf kleinen Propheten. (Handbuch z. A. T., erste Reihe, 14). Tübingen, 1938.
- E. ROHDE, Psyche. Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen. Tübingen, 1910.
- J. H. ROPES, The Epistle of St. James (The internat. critical Comm.). Edinburgh, 1916.
- CHR. FR. RÖSSLER, Bibliothek der Kirchen-Väter in Übersetzungen und Auszügen. Leipzig, 1776-1786.
- W. RUDOLPH, Chronikbücher (Handbuch z. A. T., erste Reihe, 21). Tübingen, 1955.
- A. A. VAN RULER, De vervulling van de wet. Een dogmatische studie over de verhouding van openbaring en existentie. Nijkerk, 1947.
- J. RUPPRECHT, Das Wunder in der Bibel. Eine Einführung in die Welt der göttlichen Offenbarung und der biblischen Weltanschauung. Berlin, 1936.
- A. W. F. RUTGERS, Lepra en Tuberculose. Zaandijk, 1956.
- P. SAINTYVES, Le discernement du miracle. Paris, 1909.
- , Essais de Folklore Biblique. Magie, Mythes et Miracles dans l'Ancien et le Nouveau Testament. Paris, 1922.
- J. SALVADOR, Jésus-Christ et sa doctrine. Histoire de la naissance de l'Église. Bruxelles, 1838.

- H. SCHAEFER, Jesus in psychiatrischer Beleuchtung. Eine Kontroverse. Berlin, 1910.
- E. SCHICK, Formgeschichte und Synoptikerexegese. Münster, 1940.
- A. SCHLATTER, Das Wunder in der Synagoge (Beiträge z. Förderung christlicher Theologie, 16e Jahrgang). Gütersloh, 1912.
- F. SCHLEIERMACHER, Das Leben Jesu (Vorlesungen). Herausgegeben von K. A. Rüttenik. Berlin, 1864.
- H. SCHLIER, Mächte und Gewalten im Neuen Testament (Quaestiones Disputatae 3). Zweite Auflage. Freiburg, 1959.
- H. SCHLINGENSIEPEN, Die Wunder des Neuen Testaments. Wege und Abwege ihrer Deutung in der alten Kirche bis zur Mitte des fünften Jahrhunderts. (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 2e Reihe, 28 Band). Gütersloh, 1933.
- H. SCHMIDT, Die Psalmen (Handbuch z. A. T., erste Reihe, 15). Tübingen, 1934.
- K. L. SCHMIDT, Der johanneische Charakter der Erzählung vom Hochzeitswunder in Kana (Harnack-Ehrung). Leipzig, 1921.
- , Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung. Berlin, 1919.
- WILH. SCHMIDT, Endsynthese der Religionen der Urvölker Amerikas, Asiens, Australiens, Afrikas. (Der Ursprung der Gottesidee, eine historisch-kritische und positive Studie. Band VI). Münster, 1935.
- O. SCHMIEDEL, Die Hauptprobleme der Leben-Jesu-Forschung. 2e verbess. u. vermehrte Aufl. Tübingen, 1906.
- R. SCHNACKENBURG, Gottes Herrschaft und Reich. Eine Biblisch-Theologische Studie. Freiburg, 1959.
- R. SCHNACKENBURG, Neutestamentliche Theologie. Der Stand der Forschung (Biblische Handbibliothek, Band I). München, 1963.
- C. SCHNEIDER, Einführung in die neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. Leipzig, 1934.
- , Geistesgeschichte des antiken Christentums, I-II. München, 1954.
- J. SCHNIEWIND, Das Evangelium nach Markus u. das Evangelium nach Matthäus (Das Neue Testament Deutsch I, 1, herausgeg. von P. Althaus und Joh. Behm). Göttingen, 1937.
- H. J. SCHOEPS, Jüdisch-christliches Religionsgespräch in 19 Jahrhunderten. Berlin, 1937.
- J. C. SCHREUDER, De overwinningsgedachte bij Johann Christoph Blumhardt. Kampen, 1957.
- K. SCHUBERT, Die Gemeinde vom toten Meer. München, Basel, 1958.
- W. SCHUBART, Das Weltbild Jesu. 2e unveränd. Auflage. Leipzig, 1928.
- J. E. SCHULTE, De apostel Paulus en zijn „ziekte(n)” (Nederl. Theol. Tijdschrift, 11e jaargang, afl. 2, december 1956, blz. 110-118).
- E. SCHÜRER, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. I, dritte und vierte Auflage (1901); II, dritte Auflage (1898); III, dritte Auflage (1898). Leipzig.
- A. SCHWEITZER, Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung. Fünfte, photomech. gedr. Auflage. Tübingen, 1933.
- , Die psychiatrische Beurteilung Jesu. Darstellung und Kritik. Tübingen, 1913.
- A. VAN SELMS, De Babylonische termini voor zonde. Wageningen, 1933.
- H. SENG, Die Heilungen Jesu in medizinischer Beleuchtung. (Arzt und Seelsorger, Heft 4). 2e Aufl. Königsfeld (Baden), 1926.
- G. SEVENSTER, De Christologie van het Nieuwe Testament. Amsterdam, 1946.
- , Hoofdmomenten uit de studie der Bijbelse Theologie (Vox Theologica, 28e jaargang, 1958, blz. 105-117).

- F. SIERKSMA, *De religieuze projectie. Een antropologische en psychologische studie over de projectie-verschijnselen in de godsdiensten.* Delft, 1956.
- H. E. SIGERIST, *A History of medicine. Vol. I: Primitive and archaic medicine.* New York, 1951.
- W. SIKKEN, *Het Wonder.* Kampen, 1957.
- H. SILVER, *A History of Messianic Speculation in Israel.* First published 1927. Beacon BP 80, 1959.
- R. D. G. PH. SIMONS, *Dermatologie der Tropen, met inbegrip der tropische exanthematische ziekten* (Onder redactie van Dr. R. D. G. Ph. Simons). Amsterdam, 1950.
- , *Bijgeloof en Godsziekte.* Amsterdam, 1959.
- E. L. SMELIK, *De weg van het Woord. Het Evangelie naar Johannes* (De Prediking van het N. Testament). Nijkerk, 1948.
- J. SMIT, *De Daemoniaci in Historia Evangelica.* Rome, 1912.
- W. B. SMITH, *Der vorchristliche Jesus. Nebst weiteren Vorstudien zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Urchristentums.* Giessen, 1906.
- , *Ecce Deus. Die urchristliche Lehre des reingöttlichen Jesu.* Jena, 1911.
- N. H. SNAITH, *The distinctive ideas of the Old Testament.* London, 1945.
- H. VON SODEN, *Die wichtigsten Fragen im Leben Jesu.* Berlin, 1904.
- R. SÖDER, *Die apokryphen Apostel-geschichten und die romanhafte Literatur der Antike* (Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft, drittes Heft). Stuttgart, 1932.
- W. SOLTAU, *Hat Jesus Wunder getan? Eine biblische Widerlegung kirchlichen Aberglaubens.* Leipzig, 1903.
- BENEDICTI DE SPINOZA, *Opera quot-quot reperta sunt recogniseverunt J. van Vloten et J. P. N. Land. Editio tertia.* Gouda, 1913.
- D. STAFFORD-CLARK, *Psychiatry-To-day.* (Penguin Books). London, 1953.
- C. STANGE, *Christentum und moderne Weltanschauung.* Leipzig, 1911.
- E. STAUFFER, *Jesus, Gestalt und Geschichte.* Bern, 1957.
- , *Messias oder Menschensohn?* (Novum Testamentum, Vol. I, Fasc. 2, 1956, S. 81-102).
- , *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments.* Genf, 1945.
- , *Jerusalem und Rom im Zeitalter Jesu Christi.* Bern, 1957.
- E. STEPLINGER, *Antiker Aberglaube in modernen Ausstrahlungen* (Das Erbe der Alten, Heft VII). Leipzig, 1922.
- H. L. STRACK, *Das Blut im Glauben und Aberglauben der Menschheit. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der „Volksmedizin“ und des „jüdischen Blutritus.“* 8e Auflage. München, 1900.
- , *Jesus, die Häretiker und die Christen* (Schriften des Institutum Judaicum in Berlin, Numero 37). Leipzig, 1910.
- und P. BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch.* I (1922); II (1924); III (1954); IV 1 en 2 (1956); V (1956); VI (1961). München.
- D. F. STRAUSS, *Das Leben Jesu.* 2e verbess. Aufl. Tübingen, 1837.
- C. TR. SÜETONIUS, *De XII Caesaribus.* Ed. Joannes Georgius Graevius, 1691.
- J. W. N. SULLIVAN, *The bases of modern science.* Harmondsworth Middlesex, England, 1938.
- A. SUNIER, *Mental illness and psychiatric care in Israel.* Amsterdam, 1957.
- TACITUS, *Historiae, tekstuitgave van J. W. Ph. Borleffs.* Zwolle, 1947.
- TALMUD. *The Babylonian —.* Transl. into English under the Editorship of I. Epstein. London, 1935-1952.
- V. TAYLOR, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus.* London, 1955.
- , *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching.* London, 1958.

- W. H. C. TENHAEFF, *Magnetiseurs, somnambules en gebedsgenezers. 's-Gravenhage*, 1951.
- , *Parapsychologische verschijnselen en beschouwingen*. Utrecht, 1949.
- F. R. TENNANT, *Miracle and its philosophical presuppositions*. Cambridge, 1925.
- TERTULLIAN, *De Anima*, mit Einleitung Übersetzung und Kommentar von J. H. Waszink. Amsterdam, 1933.
- TERTULLIANI quae supersunt omnia, edidit Franciscus Oehler. Lipsiae, 1853.
- TERTULLIANUS, *Over de ziel. Over het getuigenis der ziel. Over het vlees van Christus*. Bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom (Oud-christel. Geschriften XLV). Leiden, 1930.
- , *Proces tegen de ketters. Tegen de scorpioen-steek. Over de afgoderij. Tegen Hermogenes. Tegen Praxeas. Aan Scapula. Over het vluchten tijdens vervolging. Aan de martelaren*. Bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom. (Oud-christel. Geschriften XLIII). Leiden, 1929.
- , *Ter bestrijding van Marcion*, bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom (Oud-christelijke Geschriften XL (boek 1-III); XLI (boek IV, V). Leiden, 1926-1927.
- , *Tot de natiën. Tegen de Valentianen. Tegen de Joden*. Bewerkt door H. U. Meyboom (Oud-christel. Geschriften XLII). Leiden, 1927.
- THOMAS AQUINAS, *S. Thomae Aquinatis Summa totius Theologiae. Coloniae Agrippinae, ex officina Antony Hierati; sub Monocerote*, 1604.
- , *Summe der Theologie*, zusammengefasst, eingeleitet und erläutert von Joseph Bernhart. Leipzig, 1933.
- E. THURNESEN, *Die Lehre von der Seelsorge*. Zollikon, Zürich, 1946.
- A. TITUS, *Natur und Gott. Ein Versuch zur Verständigung zwischen Naturwissenschaft und Theologie*. Göttingen, 1926.
- H. E. TÖDT, *Der Menschensohn in der synoptischen Überlieferung*. Gütersloh, 1959.
- F. J. TOLSMa, *De parapsychologie*. Baarn.
- R. TOURNIER, *Bijbel en Geneeskunde* (vertal. van A. L. Boeser). Amsterdam, 1953.
- , *Radicale Therapie*. Amsterdam, 1946.
- J. TRACHTENBERG, *Jewish magic and superstition. A Study in Folk Religion*. New York, 1939.
- G. TRAUB, *Die Wunder im Neuen Testament*, 2e Auflage (Religionsgesch. Volksbücher für die deutsche christl. Gegenwart V Reihe, 2. Heft). Tübingen, 1907.
- R. CH. TRENCH, *Notes on the miracles of our Lord*. Fifth ed., revised. London, 1856.
- TROELS LUND, *Gesundheit und Krankheit in der Anschauung alter Zeiten* (Übersetzung von L. Bloch). Leipzig, 1901.
- C. L. TUINSTRa, *Het symbool in de psychanalyse*. Amsterdam, 1933.
- J. TH. UBBINK, *Het evangelie van Johannes* (Tekst en Uitleg). Groningen, den Haag, 1924.
- W. C. VAN UNNIK, *Hedendaagse problemen in de Nieuw-Testamentische Wetenschap*. Nijkerk, 1947.
- , *L'Usage de ΣΩΖΕΙΝ „sauver” et des dérivés dans les Évangiles Synoptiques*, in *La Formation des Évangiles. Problème Synoptique et Formgeschichte*, pp. 178-194. (Recherches Bibliques II). Louvain, 1957.
- , *The “Book of Acts” — the Confirmation of the Gospel* (Novum Testamentum, vol. IV, Fasc. I, 1960, pp. 26-59).
- , *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*, 1963.
- R. VEDDER, *Inleiding tot de psychiatrie*. Groningen, Batavia, 1945.
- A. VAN VELDHIJZEN, *Lukas de Medicijnmeester*. Kampen, 1926.

- B. VIOLET, Die Verfluchung des Feigenbaumes (Eucharisterion, Festschrift H. Gunkel). Göttingen, 1923.
- B. J. J. VISSER, Parapsychologie. Paragnosie-Parergie. Feiten en Hypothesen. Roermond, Maaseik, 1959.
- A. DE VISSER, Israëls ambten en bedrijven in Jezus' dagen. Groningen, 1907.
- P. VOLZ, Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. 2e Aufl. Tübingen, 1934.
- H. DE VOS, Nieuwe Testament en mythe. Het vraagstuk der ontmythologisering. Nijkerk, 1953.
- TH. C. VRIEZEN, Hoofdlijnen der Theologie van het Oude Testament. 2e druk. Wageningen, 1954.
- R. WALZER, Galen on Jews and Christians. Oxford, 1949.
- JOH. WARNECK, Die Lebenskräfte des Evangeliums. Missionserfahrungen innerhalb des animistischen Heidentums. 6e durchgesch. Aufl. Berlin, 1922.
- J. H. WASZINK, W. C. v. UNNIK, CH. DE BEUS (redactie), Het oudste christendom en de antieke cultuur. Haarlem, 1951.
- L. D. WEATHERHEAD, Psychology, Religion and Healing. London, 1951.
- O. WEINREICH, Antike Heilungswunder. Untersuchungen zum Wunderglauben der Griechen und Römer. Giessen, 1909.
- , Gebet und Wunder (in: Genethliakon Wilhelm Schmid). Stuttgart, 1929.
- C. F. VON WEIZSÄCKER, Zum Weltbild der Physic. 2e erweit. Auflage. Leipzig, 1944.
- , Atomenergie und Atomzeitalter. Zwölf Vorlesungen. Frankfurt am Main, 1957.
- A. WENZL, Die philosophischen Grenzfragen der modernen Naturwissenschaft. Stuttgart, 1954.
- A. D. WHITE, Histoire de la lutte entre la science et la Théologie (traduit par K. de Varigny et G. Adam). Paris, 1899.
- A. N. WHITEHEAD, Science and the modern world. Pelican Books, 1938.
- W. WILKENS, Die Entstehungsgeschichte des vierten Evangeliums. Zollikon, 1958.
- H. WINDISCH, De tegenwoordige stand van het Christusprobleem, 2de druk. Assen, 1925.
- P. WINTER, On the trial of Jesus (Studia Judaica, herausgegeben von E. L. Ehrlich, Basel, Band I). Berlin, 1961.
- H. W. WOLFF, Herrschaft Jahwes und Messiasgestalt im Alten Testament (Zeitschrift f. d. Alttestam. Wissenschaft. 13. Band, 1936. Heft 3/4). Berlin.
- T. WOOLSTON, A discourse on the miracles of our Saviour, Sixth ed. London, 1729.
- E. WORCESTER, S. MC COMB, I. K. CORIAT, Religion and medicine. New York, 1908.
- A. S. VAN DER WOUDE, Die messianischen Vorstellungen der Gemeinde von Qumran. Assen, 1957.
- W. WREDE, Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien. Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markusevangeliums. Göttingen, 1901.
- R. WÜNSCH, Antike Fluchtafeln. (kleine Texte, 20). Bonn, 1912.
- TH. ZAHN, Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Dritte, vielfach besichtigte und vervollständigte Auflage. Leipzig, 1924.
- D. A. ZAMBACO PACHA, La lèpre à travers les siècles et les contrées. Paris, 1914.
- G. ZORAB, Het Opstandingsverhaal in het licht der parapsychologie. 's-Gravenhage, 1949.
- , Magnetiseurs en Wondergenezers. Leiden.
- , Proscopie, Het raadsel der toekomst. 's-Gravenhage, 1953.
- J. DE ZWAAN, Inleiding tot het Nieuwe Testament. Haarlem, 1941-1942.

TEXT INDEX

OLD TESTAMENT

<i>Genesis</i>		<i>Exodus</i>		<i>Exodus</i>		<i>Leviticus</i>	
1	585	12	183	25	256	14	415
1:6-8	665, 667	14	661	26:4	355	24	623
8	666	16	534	27:20 f.	311	20:10	500
9-10	666	4	242	28:6	355	27	139
21, 28	673	4:1-9	264	33 ff.	355	21:18	435
31	528	6, 7	474, 490	35	355	22:10	500
2:2	460	8, 9, 17 f.		29:33	500	17-25	435
7	426	246, 247		38-41	615	23:17 ff.	625
3:6	697	11	415	30:11-16	680	26:16	256, 553
9	200, 226, 583	24-26	354	33	500		
6:1 ff.	342	29	534	34:10	705	<i>Numbers</i>	
14	606	30 f.	245	29	398	5:2	474, 476
15	233	31	264	39:2	355	18	470
16	233	7-14	195			10:10	355
18	233	7:1	238	<i>Leviticus</i>		11:1 f.	195
18:9	583	1 f.	238	1:4	315	5	477
19:14-16	328	9	183	9 ff.	354	16, 24	534
26	328	10-12	158	2	311	23	313
20:7	238	14-25	601	3:15 f.	354	28	560
17	260, 279, 293	20	645	4:4	315	33	256
21:30	489	22	158	8-12	354	12	279
22	233	8:7	158	6:16	680	12:1-16	256, 474
25:22	258	19	183	10:1 f.	195	10	474
26:1-6	233	23	246	13	294, 467, 468	10 ff.	490, 491
19	354	9:9-12	470	13:2	468	14	309
27:1	256	10:1 f.	246	6	469	14:11	245
37	315	12:10 ff.	501	12 f.	469, 492	12	256
28:10-17	188	21	534	12-16	475	18	258
10-22	233	22	354	18	480	22	264
12	192	43	500	45	470, 471	15:2-10	615
30:14 ff.	354	14:16, 21	640	45 ff.	470	37 ff.	511
31:44f.	489	21-31	658	14	294, 354, 467, 468, 470, 487	38 ff.	355
32:1f.	233	22, 28 f.	667	14:4	295	16:25	534
22-32	233	26 ff.	644	4-7	471	19:13	354
25, 32	256	31	245	48 ff.	354	21	354
34:25	256	15:23-25	601	54-57	468	20:1 ff.	601
37:30	622	26	256, 293, 356	15:8	309	21:4-9	195, 293, 345
38:28	355	16	624	15:25 ff.	510	6 ff.	354
41:42	317	16:18	634	15:27	317	6, 9	256
46:26	632	17:1 ff.	601	16	345	23:7	161
50:2	294	15	534	17-26	472	24:4	401
2-4	584	20:5	258	17:7	345	32:41	567
		22:18	139, 140	15	317	33:3	313
<i>Exodus</i>		28	445				
3:6	323	23:2	162	19:2	256		

<i>Deuteronomy</i>		<i>Joshua</i>		<i>I Samuel</i>		<i>II Kings</i>	
1:30-33	264	2:18, 21	355	21:14	371	1:2	294
2:14	454	3	234, 645, 658	22:5	238	2-4	256, 407
3:24	233	4	234, 645, 658	24:14	413	9-12	195
4:7	643	5:8	256	25:37	256	9-18	238
34	246	13-15	234, 662	28	139, 344	2:8	645
5:9	258	6	234	28:14	584	11-14	658
6:4	293	7:6	534	30:12	572	14	658
9	354	16-26	195			19-22	601
22	195	19	500	<i>II Samuel</i>		23-25	195
7:12-16	260	8:10	534	3:8	413	3:13	594
14 f.	256	29	344	4:4	256	4:1-7	238, 601, 624
19	246	10	40, 56	5:8	435	8-17	238
11:3	701	10:10-14	234	6:5	355	8-37	575
13:1-5	242	24:1	534	6 f.	195, 234	18-37	238, 349, 559
2-6	163	7	644	7:2	238	29	316, 560
9	159	25-27	489	9:8	413	33	327
15:21	435			13	435	42	622
18:10-13	139	<i>Judges</i>		16:2	615	42-44	238, 624
15-18	237	2:1-5	234	9	413	5	293, 354, 452, 490, 491, 499, 501
19:11-13	534	3:19 ff.	328	10	594	5:1-14	238
21-26	472	6:11-24	234	18:17	344	1-27	475
21:1-9	344, 534	17	246	19:22	379, 594	9 ff.	329
18-21	534	36-40	234	28	435	15	245
22 f.	344	8:6	238	24:1-17	195	20-27	195
22:12	355, 511	10:3-5	567	10-17	234	27	161, 256, 474
13-21	534	11:12	379, 594	15	256	6:6	658
23:18	413	34	573	<i>I Kings</i>		13-23	195
25	212	13:2 ff.	234	7:15 ff.	354	15	598
24:8 f.	474	25	234	8:37-40	260	7	475
9	256	15:18 ff.	601	11:29	238	7:1-11	475
25:9	309	18 f.	234	13:1-10	234	3	476, 496
26:14	344	19	572	4	439	17	195
27:18	415	21:2	496	11-32	195, 234	8:1-3	195
28:21, 22, 59 ff	256	<i>I Samuel</i>		14:1-18	234	9:22	139, 140
27, 35	293	3	234	17 ff.	234	13:20 f.	559
28	417	5, 6	234	17:1	195	21	577
28 f.	415	5:5	355	7-16	624	15:5 f.	473
29: 22 f.	256	7	313	8-24	575	18:4	354
30:3	260	6:4 ff.	354	10-16	238	20	40
12	162	5	313, 500	17-24	238, 559	20:1-11	293
31:6, 7, 23	124	9	102	18	379, 594	8-10	246
19, 26	489	7	234	19	327	20	430
32	264	9:6	234	21	316	22:14	238
32:5	399	10	198	23	543		
17	345	10:6	238	24	245		
39	293	11:4	496	18	195		
33:3	313	16:14	195	18:39	245		
34:10	238	14, 23	362	19:1-22	264		
10-12	234, 238	17:43	413	<i>II Kings</i>		<i>I Chronicles</i>	
<i>Joshua</i>		18:10	362	1-13	234	16:8	701
1:6, 7, 9, 18	124	19:24	362, 401				

<i>I Chronicles</i>		<i>Psalms</i>		<i>Psalms</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>	
22:13	124	9:1	500	16	354	11:1 f.	187
28:20	124	11	701	105:1	701	2	646
29:12	313	10:12	313	20	290	4	102
		19:8 f.	325	106:9	640	5	239
		21:8	313	37	345	11	313
<i>II Chronicles</i>		22	356	107:17-20	256	12:4	701
6:28-31	260	28:5	701	23 ff.	666	13	353
7:14	260	30:2	260	25-30	644	13:21	345
11:15	345	2 f.	278	109:4	325	14:7	290
16:12	294, 295	31:5	313	110:2	646	29	345
21:14 f., 18 f.	256	12	256	121:1	326	17:10 f.	256
26:16-21	234	33:7	644	123:1	326	19:8	671
16-23	476	37	257	139:5	313	22	256, 260
21	473	37:19	634	6	546	20:1-6	695
30:20	260	38:2	313	145:1	165	22:1	594
32:7	124	2-11	256	15 f.	634	25:6	615
30	430	14	406	146:7	290	26:11	313
35:21	594	39:10	256	8	415	27:8	644
		41:1-3	278	147:3	260	28:7	615
<i>Ezra</i>		4	256, 260	18	644	29:18	296, 415, 528
2:65	632	44:2	313	148:6	47	30:6	345
10:14	534	50:15	278			26	260
		51:5	258	<i>Proverbs</i>		33:24	260
<i>Nehemiah</i>		7	354	8:17, 34 ff.	611	34:13	345
3:1, 32	451	58:3	258	9:1-5	611	14	345
9:16, 17	264	65:7	644	13:15	345	35:3, 6	449
10:32	680	10	623	15:29	433	4 ff.	297
12:39	451	66:5, 6	701	22:9	348	5	415, 417
		72:17	559	23:6	348	5 f.	296, 525, 528
<i>Esther</i>		73	257	31-33	615	6	220, 435
2:5	567	77:12-21	701	28:22	348	37:6, 7, 33-37	234
		16	644	30:4	644	38:1-8	234, 260, 293
<i>Job</i>		78	233			17	260
2:7-10	480	78:11	701	<i>Ecclesiastes</i>		22	183
5:18	256, 313	32	264	9:7	615	40	36, 37
9:8	658	80	615	10:19	615	42:1-4	369
34	102	88:3, 7	256			7	415
12:7	671	89:33	257			12	500
15	644	91:5	356	<i>Isaiah</i>		16	415
18:13	349	5 f.	349	1:5-6	256	18	415
14	346	13	226	6	311	45:24	446
15	345	14	225	25	313	47:12 f.	139
19:21	313	15	278	3:15	594	48:13	313
21:9	102	92:12 ff.	354	18	355	50:6	309
28:25	505, 644	95:4	313	20	355	53	296
30:1	413	5	644	5:1-7	615	53:4	260
10	309	96:5	345	11 f., 22	615	12	182
31:8	623	102:20	290	12	313	55:1	615
33:25	257	103:3	257, 260, 293	17	559	1 f.	611
39:10	623	3 f.	278	7:11, 14	183, 247		
		104	666	14	246		
<i>Psalms</i>		104:15	614	8:6	430, 431		
6:2	256, 293			9:5	646		

<i>Isaiah</i>		<i>Jeremiah</i>		<i>Hosea</i>		<i>Jonah</i>	
57:8	354	16:4	256	4:11	615	16	646
15	547	21	313	5:13	256		
15 f.	447	17:14	260	6:1	256	<i>Micah</i>	
18 f.	260	19:1-13	695	7:1	260	5:3	646
58:1 ff.	297	21:6	256	9:10, 16	694, 695	6:15	311
61	291	23:23	546	10:4	623	7:1	694, 695
61:1	220, 296, 528	28:15-17	234	11:3	260	14	559
1 f.	187, 254,	29:17	256	12:11	345		
	296	30:12-15	256	12	623	<i>Nabum</i>	
8	681	31:8	435	13:14	350	1:3 f.	644
65:4	390	29	258	15	644	4	640
11	345	33:6	260	14:4	260	3:4	140
13 ff.	541	40:4	290	9	594		
17 f.	540	48:33	615			<i>Zephaniah</i>	
66:3	413	50:39	345	<i>Amos</i>		1:9	355
3, 17	390			4:10	256		
		<i>Ezekiel</i>		13	644	<i>Zechariah</i>	
<i>Jeremiah</i>		4:1-15	695	5:8	644	1:18-21	173
2:13	354	13:17-23	140, 355	8:10	573	21	173
18	594	18:2	258	9:6	644	8:4	559
3:22	260	20	257			10:7	615
5:3	102	32:27	584	<i>Jonah</i>		12:4	415, 417
6:14	260	44:17-19	356	1-4	234	10	573
8:11	260			1:1-17	646	13:1	354
13	694	<i>Daniel</i>		4	644, 646	2	372
13:1-11	695	4:33	347	5	646	7	313
12-14	601	5:12	355	6	646	14:8	354
16	500	23	313	11	646		
14:17	256	7:14	446, 447	15	671	<i>Malachi</i>	
						1:8, 13	435

NEW TESTAMENT

<i>Matthew</i>		<i>Matthew</i>		<i>Matthew</i>		<i>Matthew</i>	
3:11	182	44 f.	200		480, 493	8 f.	536
12	195	6:5	273	1, 18	129	8-12	531
4:3 f.	686	5-13	267	2	481	9	537, 538,
12 ff.	412	5-15	273	2, 8	363		548
17	285	7	454	3	313, 325,	10	499, 539
18	671	12	261		481, 485,	11 f.	209, 540
18-21	670	15	695	4	368, 480,	13	266, 328,
19	672	25-34	629		481, 486, 488		329, 333, 531
23	101, 102,	33	634	5	533		532, 544
	403	7:6	413	5-13	135, 265,	14	551, 554
23 f.	285	7	278, 694		266, 270, 332,	14 f.	551
24	101, 103,	7-12	273		530, 532, 533,	15	313, 551,
	129, 371, 372,	22	181, 218,		541, 542		552
	436		243, 282, 372	6	102, 436,	16	103, 132,
25	129, 523	28	129, 181		543, 544		285, 371, 372
5:6	541, 696	28 f.	181, 198	6, 8, 13	532	16 f.	296
17	480, 489	29	181	7	533, 546,	16, 28, 33	372
17-20	487	8:1	482		593	17	101, 260
22	535, 567	1-4	240, 464,	8	536, 537	19, 22 f.	649

<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Matthew</i>
20 418	27; 27-31 132,	439, 536	16 631
23 143	267, 417	10 148, 212,	17 622
23-27 638	27-31 418, 423	437, 438	18 f. 634
24 568, 639	27-34 406, 417,	11 505	19 271, 326,
25 638	418, 434	13 325	327, 621, 622,
26 642	28 f. 268	14 128	627
27 129	29 266, 313,	15 129, 285	20 623, 632,
28-34 132,	418	16 241, 368,	634
382, 385, 422	30 368	370	21 632
29 103, 363,	31 129	22 372	22 651
385, 387, 388,	32 372, 406	22 ff. 135, 406	22 f. 45
594	32-34 406, 418	22-24 407,	22-33 650
31 206, 372,	33 129, 407	408, 418	23 270
391	33 f. 372	23 129	24 103, 651
32 325, 368	34 128, 149,	24 128, 149,	24-33 664
33 653	150, 157, 170	157, 264	26 653, 659,
9:1 449, 536	407, 408	24 ff. 291, 372	662
1-8 146, 261,	35 101, 102,	25 198	27 124
440	285	27 135, 140,	28 661
2 124, 265,	36 239	147, 243	28-31 185
443, 449	10:1 101, 181,	28 135, 187,	28-33 662
2-7 189	223, 285, 372	189, 252, 291,	29 668
2, 6 436, 448	5 393	324	33 129, 265
2, 22, 29 539	7 f. 218	29 182	34 650, 651
3 146, 445	8 101 102, 197,	38 192	35 103
4 198	372, 464, 491	38 ff. 183	36 205, 313,
6 181, 325,	17 535	39 163	316, 317, 355,
446, 457	18 488	41 ff. 239	516, 535
8 129, 181,	40 220	43 334, 346,	15:2 314, 504
446, 448	11:2 ff. 220	372	15 664
10 517	2-6 235	43-45 334, 408	17 ff. 200
10, 28 681	3 195	45 346, 348,	21-28 265,
12 103, 293	4 186	372, 410, 411,	411, 597
12 f. 293	5 250, 296, 417,	459	22 363, 372,
13 434, 696	436, 464, 566	13:5 127	412
14-17 567	6 268	25 568	23 413
15 198	18 372, 377	42 209	24 430
18 399, 565	19 615	47 671	24, 26 393
18-26 559, 567	20 f. 181	47 ff. 671	25 363
20 104, 121,	20-24 186, 245,	53-58 128,	27 363
313, 511,	264, 489, 697	198, 264	28 328, 329,
516	21, 23 128	54 129	333, 594
20-22 280, 509	25 271	54, 58 181	29 523
21 315, 511	27 201, 273,	55 173	29-31 285, 523
22 124, 266,	485	57 190	29-39 619, 623
512	12:1 683	58 132, 190	30 129
23 568	1-8 212	14:2 128, 181	30 f. 417, 436
23-26 124	5, 6, 41 215	13 129, 620	31 129, 624
24 568	7 696	13-21 619	32 239, 244,
25 570	9 436	14 102, 239,	624
26 129, 285	9-14 146,	244, 285	32-38 620
27 363, 368	212, 264, 436,	15 622	34, 37 620

<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Matthew</i>	<i>Mark</i>
36 271	245, 313, 418	27:27 f. 122	271, 481, 494
37 634	21:1-11 688	30 309	42 481, 484
39 624	2 f. 198	39 f. 122	43 418, 482
16:1 146, 192	11, 46 237	42 193	44 125, 368,
1 f. 183	12-17 688	43 265	486, 489
8 ff. 187	14 417, 436	52 569	45 129, 482,
9-10 632	14 f. 193	53 566	490
9-12 619, 620	15 128, 183	54 533	2:1 ff. 261, 440,
14 237, 296	15 f. 146	56, 61 410	443-445, 457
16 239	17 688	63 149	2, 13 129
16, 20 370	18 691	28 218	3 443
17 616	18 f. 695	28:1 410	3 ff. 436
17-19 664	18-20 688	18 181, 513	3-5, 9 448
20 369	18-22 185, 688	18 f. 229, 284	4 441, 443,
21 198	19 688, 689		454
28 199	20 692, 694	<i>Mark</i>	5 263, 443
17:7 313	20-22 265	1:7 182	5-10 446
14-21 104, 397	21 694	16 671	6 f. 445
15 103, 363,	21 f. 688	16-20 670, 672	7 445
399	22 231, 273	17 672	8 198, 445
17 399	23, 24, 27 181	21-28 206, 378,	9, 11 457
18 372, 400	42 183	436, 536	10 181, 446
20 222, 269,	22:22 129	22 129, 181	11 125, 271,
399, 401, 694	29 181	23 379	446, 455
21 401	33 129	23, 26 f. 372	12 125, 129
22 198	46 128	24 127, 363,	16 f. 463
24 681	23:5 355	367, 379, 380,	17 103
24-27 185, 664,	15 412	594	19 593
680-684,	24:19 199	25 368, 552	19-22 607
686, 687, 694	24 183, 243	26 381	23-28 212
24 ff. 197, 672	36 199, 200	27 129, 268	27 f. 215
25 681	25:3 ff. 311	28 129	28 215
27 671, 685	5 568	29 316, 551	3:1 109, 436,
18:8 436	36 101	29-31 551	438, 439
19 f. 273, 695	39 101	31 125, 551,	1-5 135, 536
21 664	43 101	552	1-6 216, 436
35 695	44 101	32 103, 371,	2 437
19:1 f. 285	26:6 479	372	4 213, 505
25 129	6 f. 464	33 129	5 271, 448
28 209, 697	18 198	34 101, 103,	6 128, 215
20:17-19 198	21 198	132, 364,	7 f. 129
28 182	27 271	368, 370	8 285
29 129	29 209	34, 39 372	10 102, 313,
29-31 267	31 199	35 270	317, 516
29 ff. 385, 418,	31, 34 198	38 482	11 102, 363, 372
422	34 199	39 481	12 368
30 424	41 102, 273	40 481, 484	14 f. 218, 222,
30-34 132	53 188, 192,	40 f. 483	285
30 f. 363	271	40-45 135,	15 181
31 418	61 f. 150	464, 480, 491,	15, 22 372
33 363, 424	67 309	495, 497	17 571
34 239, 244,	67 f. 122	41 239, 245,	20 504

<i>Mark</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Mark</i>	<i>Mark</i>
20, 32 129	27 ff. 316	39 621, 622	5, 6, 8 620
22 149, 150,	28 509	40 622, 633	10 624
157	29 102, 511	41 634	11 146, 192
22 ff. 135, 408	30 181, 315,	43 623	11 ff. 183
23-27 208	512, 513, 516	44 633	12 582
27 182	30 f. 192	45-52 650,	19-21 620
30 372	31 516	652, 663	22 240, 313
4:1 129, 670	32 ff. 517	46 270	22-26 180, 418,
5 127	34 102, 269,	47 651	419, 423,
27, 38 568	518	48 103, 652	523, 526
35 638	35 568	49 650, 653,	23 122, 309,
35-41 135, 638,	37 568	662	323, 327, 421,
647	37, 40 568	50 124	426, 526
36 639	38 568	51 128, 129,	24 420
37 639, 642,	39 568, 569	653	26 368
646	40 122, 327	52 128, 632	27 f. 238
37-41 650	41 325, 527,	53 650, 651	27-30 678
38 638, 646	571	55 103	28 237
39 271, 646,	42 129, 571	56 101, 192,	30 369
647	43 125, 368	313, 317, 516	9:1 211
40 269	6:1-6 128	7 309	2-8 678
41 128, 646,	2 129	7:11 571	14 397
653	2, 5 181	17 411	14 ff. 221, 397,
5:1-13 383	3 267	24-30 135, 411,	401
1-20 102, 133,	4 190, 237	524	15 398
135, 382, 396	5 102, 132,	25 372	17 363, 372,
2 346	191	26, 29 f. 372	401, 403
2, 8, 13 372	5 f. 190, 238	27 411, 593	18 182, 348
3-5 120	5, 13 102	28 363	18-22 120
7 103, 127,	6 499	29 333, 414	19 399
363, 367,	7 181, 222,	29 f. 328	19 ff. 593
385, 594	372, 399	31 523, 621,	20 372
8 368, 385	7-13 218	623	21 121
9 388	11 488, 489	31 ff. 180, 220,	21-27 401
9, 13 396	12 f. 285	523, 528	22 240
12 127	13 102, 311,	32 240, 310,	23 265, 400
13 127, 348	312, 372	406, 525,	23 f. 269
14 384	14 128, 181,	527, 528	24 266
15 f., 18 372	237, 542	32 ff. 419, 523,	25 335, 348,
17 527	15 237	525	368, 372,
19 527	22 ff. 527	33 122, 309,	403, 406
19 f. 245	31 523	310, 313, 322,	26 400
20 129, 523	31-44 619	323, 327, 526	29 271, 401
21 567	32 620	34 271, 325-	33 198, 681
21, 24 129	32-53 620	327, 527, 571	37 430
22-43 559, 567	34 129, 239,	37 129	38 140, 243,
23 543	285	8 309	323, 334, 372
24 509	34-44 135	8:1 129	38-40 140, 222
25-34 509, 513	35 621	1-10 619, 620,	40 140
26 121, 510,	35 f. 622	623	43 436
511	37 622	2 239	45 436
27 317, 511	38 622	2 f. 624	10 423

<i>Mark</i>		<i>Mark</i>		<i>Luke</i>		<i>Luke</i>	
10:1	285	35	651	23	85	18	441, 443
1-46	129	36	568	24	190, 237	18-26	189, 261,
24	129	14:3	464, 479	24-27	190		436, 440, 502
26	129	5	418	25	191	18, 24	448
40	203	12-16	198	27	191, 464,	19	441, 443
46	571	13	132		497, 499	20	443
46 ff.	322, 418,	15	621	28-30	128	21	445
	422	18	198	31-37	378,	22	198
47	363, 418,	27, 30	198		436, 536	24	181, 446,
	424	36	571	32	129, 181		457
48	363	37, 40 f.	568	33	372, 379	25	125, 129
49	124, 425	46	556	34	363, 594	26	129, 447
50	425	47	132, 556	35	368, 381	31	103
51	363, 424,	57-59	150	35, 41	372	31 f.	297
	425	15:29 f.	150	36	129, 181,	6:1-5	212
52	245, 269,	40, 47	410		372	6	436, 438
	424	46	584	37	129	6-11	212, 436,
11:1-10	688	16:1, 9	410	38	551, 553,		502, 504, 536
2 f.	198	5	385		554	7	437
11	688	9	372, 410	38 f.	551	8	198
11 ff.	197	17	206, 218	39	123, 317,	9	213
12-14	688, 696	17-20	218		551, 552, 554	10	438
12-14, 20 f.	695	18	102, 224,	40	101	11	128, 504,
13	688, 689		225	40 f.	132		505
14	688, 692,	20	6, 250,	41	363, 367,	12	270
	693		283		368, 370, 371	17	101, 129
14, 23	648			42	129	17 f.	285
15-19	688	<i>Luke</i>		43	482	18	372
17	694	1:2	286	44	285	19	313, 315,
18	128, 129	15	615	5:1	673		513, 516
20	689, 694	23	497	1-11	185, 197,	21	541
20 f.	688	35	182, 513		670, 672, 678	22	432
20-24	688	51	182	1, 15	129	7:1-10	332, 530,
20 ff.	265, 696	68	290	2-6	671		533, 542
21	694	68, 78	575	4 f.	673	2	103, 533,
22 f.	269	2:38	290	5	497, 675		542-544
22-26	688, 694	40-52	198	6	678	2, 3, 10	532
23	647, 694	41-52	202	8-11	245	3	534, 535,
24	694	48	129	9	128		538, 542
25	695	3:16	182	11	672	6	363, 536
27-33	688	21	270	12	363, 481,	6-9	531
28, 29, 33	181	4:1, 14, 18	192		496	7	532, 537, 548
12:11	183	13	291	12-16	480	8	329, 538
17	129	14	129, 181	12 ff.	46, 464	9	203, 499, 539
24	181	14 f.	285	13	481, 499	10	328, 540,
34	128	14-30	296	14	368, 486,		544
43 f.	198	14, 36	513		497	11	124, 129,
13:9	488, 535	15	129	15	101, 129,		576
22	183	16 ff.	187, 236		285	11-17	559, 565,
26	211	17-21	296	16	270		573
32	199, 201,	18	291	17	193, 441,	13	239, 245
	203	21	236, 254		444, 513	14	313

<i>Luke</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>Luke</i>	<i>Luke</i>
14 f. 574	43 ff. 46, 509	9 101	13 129, 500
16 129, 237,	44 511	13 181	14 128, 148,
238, 296,	45 199, 200,	17 222, 372	213, 535
500, 575	516	18 f. 208	14-16 504
17 129, 285	46 181, 317,	19 181, 221,	15 505
21 101, 102,	512, 513, 516	224	16 216, 520,
372	46 ff. 518	20 372	522
21 f. 417	47 130, 517	21 193	17 505, 522
22 186, 296,	48 304, 501,	22 201	22 495
436, 464, 497,	518	31 240	22-35 496
499, 573	48, 50 500	34 311	23 237
23 268	49 535, 568	38-42 495, 576	28 f. 540, 541
33 372, 615	51 568	40 554	32 285, 372
34 615	52 568	11:1 270, 496	33 237
36-50 410, 578	53 570	5-8 273	57 237
37 504	55 571	9 695	14:1 496
39 237	56 129	14 129, 372	1-6 146, 502,
47 449	9:1 101, 181, 221	14 f. 406, 408	504, 507
47 f. 262	1-6 218, 285	14 f., 18-20 372	1-16 212
48 ff. 501	1, 42, 49 372	14-28 335	2 212, 507
50 500	5 488, 489	15 128, 149,	3 213
8:1-3 409	8 237	157	4 505
2 101, 372,	10 620	16 183, 192	4, 6 128
388, 410	10-17 619	19 147	13, 21 436
2, 27, 29, 30,	11 285	20 252, 324	25 129
33, 35, 38 372	11, 37 129	20-22 182	15:1 129
3 542	12 621, 622	21 f. 182	11-32 261
4, 19, 40 129	13 622	22 182	16:19-31 576, 577
22-25 638	14 622	24 334, 372	20 479
23 639	16 634	24-26 334, 408	23, 28 103
24 638, 642	17 623, 634	26 372, 388,	17:6 269, 694
24, 45 497	18 270	410, 411	11-19 464,
25 128, 129	19 237	27 496	494, 495,
26-39 382	28 f. 270	29 129	502, 503
27 372	33, 49 497	29 ff. 183	13 363, 497
28 103, 363,	37-43 397	30 206	14 240, 499
385, 594	38 363, 572,	12:1 129	15 129, 500
29 346, 372,	573	5 181	15 f. 245
385	38 f. 399	22-32 629	15 ff. 197
30 199, 200,	39 372	13:1-5 257	17-19 281, 500
368, 388	41 399	3 ff. 187	18 500
30 ff. 647	42 372, 400	4 430	19 266, 501
31 389	43 129	6 85	29 346
32, 38 348	47 198	6-9 694-696	18:1-8 273
36 372	48 430	7 128, 692	11 273
37 393	49 323, 334	10 496	13 326
38 505	49 f. 222	10-17 146, 148	35-43 422
41 504	51 495, 496	212, 502,	36 129
41-56 559, 567	51-56 195	504, 520	37 424, 652
42 509, 572,	52, 56 496	11 101, 121,	38 363, 424
573	54 346	212, 372	39 363
43 85, 510	10:1-20 218	12 101, 594	41 363, 424

<i>Luke</i>		<i>John</i>		<i>John</i>		<i>John</i>	
41 f.	425	35-51	592, 611	53	532		494
42	266, 424, 500	39	596	46-54	530, 533	36, 38	430
		41, 49 ff.	616	47	542, 547	40	617
43	129, 245, 425, 500	43	591	47 f.	543	50	531
		47 f.	455	47 ff.	533	6:1	621
19:1-10	262	48	199	48	183, 270, 593	1-13	619
3	129	50 f.	220			1-15	614
9	522	51	188, 192, 617	49	363, 531, 532, 547	2	101, 129, 183
30-32	198			50	266, 329, 333, 543	4	450, 621
37	181	2:1	591, 610			5	633, 635
20:2, 8	181	1 f.	591	50-53	328	6	249, 622
26, 40	128	1-11	143, 197, 590, 601, 607, 611, 612, 613	51	532	7	622
21:11,25	183			52	293, 544, 545	8 f.	622
36	273	3-5	591			10	621, 622
22:3	348	4	249, 271, 379, 594, 596, 597, 617	52 f.	332, 596	11	622, 631, 634
8	132			53	245, 249, 332, 532, 547-549	12	632
21	198	6	598			12 f.	634
30	209	6-8	591	54	183	13	623
32	270, 278	8	600	5:1	450	14	237, 245, 249, 296, 623
34	198	9	608	1-5	452	14 f.	239
39-46	270	9 f.	591	1-18	146, 212, 450	14 ff.	237
46	568	10	600			15	636
49	556	11	128, 183, 245, 249, 426, 548, 616	2	431	16-21	650
49-51	556			3	101, 436	19	653, 659
50	132, 557	13	450	5	101, 104, 121, 212	21	127, 654
51	133, 313, 556, 557	23	183, 543	7	101, 363	22-59	635
		25	199	8 f.	213	25	654
54	556	3:2	183	9	125	26	264
57	594			10	213, 457	26, 30	183
23:2	149	17, 34	430	14	258, 259	29, 57	430
8	183	23	431	14-16	462	37	617
47	533	29	593	16	214	38	585
24:4	385	35	187, 190	17	187, 460, 461	39, 40, 44,	
10	410	43	543			54	566
19	181, 237, 285, 316, 646	4:5	431	18	128, 212, 460, 461	51-58	636
21	290	6	596	19 f.	203	53	611
28	652	7, 15	599	19, 30	585	61	199
30	678	18 f.	199	20 f.	220, 566	63	462
37	662	19	237, 432	20-29	184	64	199
49	218, 513	20-24	273	20, 36	219	7:1-9	596
		21	594	21	187, 485	1-13	597
<i>John</i>		21, 23	596	25, 28	596	3 ff.	597
1:1-5	591	22	271	27	181	3, 21	219
14	615	34	187	28	583	5	264
17	610	42	300	28 f.	199, 588	6	596, 597
19	591	44	190, 237	29	458	6, 39	595
21	237	46 101, 431, 533, 542, 549, 591, 608, 612, 616		30	203	10	596
25	237	46, 47, 50,		36	187, 488,	14-24	214
26, 33	610					16	585
29	591, 611					22-24	212
35	591						

<i>John</i>	<i>John</i>	<i>John</i>	<i>John</i>
23 187, 214,	30 201	3 190	21 430
262	32 187	15, 35 219	21, 26 678
27 f. 600	37 f. 187, 264	21 199	29 219
29 430	38 184	27 348	30 f. 245, 249,
30 596	11 124, 300	36-38 199	265
31 183, 245,	11:1 101, 431	14:10-12 219	21 671
249, 265	1-44 559, 576,	11 187, 218,	21:1 659
40 237	583	264	1 f. 673
52 237	3 101	12 218, 219,	1-14 197, 670,
8:10 f. 594	4 101, 249,	229	672, 675
14 600	259, 426, 579,	12-14 273	5 675
20 596	589, 616	21-24 617	7 662
21 459	4, 15, 45 249	28 203	9, 10, 13 622
29 585	6 101	15:1 ff. 607, 615	11 610
42 430	6, 17 596	11 615	16 543
48 f. 372	7-16 579	16 273	17 199
57 454	9 596	24 219, 488,	25 193
59 426	11 569	494	
9 286, 420,	15, 42, 45 245	16:2 432	<i>Acts</i>
425, 428, 431	17-19 580	2, 4, 25, 32 596	1:8 181
9:1 121, 212	20-27 580	8-11 219	2 218
1-41 146, 212	25 f. 566	16 199	2:7 129
300	33, 38 418	21 596	19 183, 346
2 f. 458, 459	33-44 582	23 278	22 181, 183
3 249, 253,	34 199, 200	23, 24, 26 273	43 183, 217
258, 426	37 183, 570	32 199	3:1-10 217
3 f. 219	38 583	33 124, 183	2 121, 436
4 187, 426,	40 286	17:1 326, 327,	4 326
579, 585	41 271, 327	596	6 218
6 309	42 273, 430	2 181, 187	10 129
6 f. 452	44 584	3, 8, 21, 23,	11 129
6, 14 213	45, 48 265	25 430	12 129
6 ff. 427	45-53 128	9 278	16 266
7 428-431	46 570	13 615	22 f. 237
13-24 240	46 f. 149	20 219	4:9 101, 243
16 146, 183	47 183	18:4 199	16 183
17 237	47 f. 146, 149	10 132	24 496
22 433	48 149	10 f. 556	29 f. 250, 283
24 500	55 450	26 557	30 183
29 158	12:2 554	28 534	33 181
29 f. 600	10 f. 249	19:9 600	36 218
30 183	10, 11, 37,	12, 15 542	5:1-11 217
30-39 245	43 264	13 431	12 183
31 148, 433	11 249, 265	17 431	12-16 217
38 249	11, 17-19 245	18 181	15 101, 218,
39 434	18, 37 183	25 410	221, 318
10:10 615	21, 23 596	26 594	16 101, 372
18 183	23, 27 596	20:1, 11, 16,	17-20 217
21 372	24 187	18 410	36 174
25 187	24 f. 200	8 286	6:8 181, 183,
25, 32, 37,	42 432	13, 15 594	217
38 219	13:1 596	16 431	15 217

<i>Acts</i>		<i>Acts</i>			246	5:18	615
7:30	346	16:16	372	30	278	6:10	182
36	183	16-18	217			12	208, 353, 644
37	237	17	363, 386	<i>I Corinthians</i>		<i>Philippians</i>	
39	569	18	218, 334,	1:1	218	2:5 ff.	704
55	326		372	22	32, 163	26	101
57	390	19-40	217	25, 27	102	27	101
60	569	17:8	389	2:4	217	3:2	413
8:6	183	18:8, 17	535	8	617	4:6	278
6-8, 13	217	19:11 f.	217	4:10	102	<i>Colossians</i>	
7	372, 436	11 ff.	221	5:4	181	1:11	182
9	140	12	101, 218,	6:10	615	15 f.	705
9 ff.	297		318, 355	7:16	594	4:14	85
13	129, 183	12 ff.	372	8:9-12	102	<i>I Thessalonians</i>	
39	217	13	147, 323,	9:22	102	1:5	217, 246
9:1, 2, 11	389		334, 375	10:20	372	5:6	569
2	220	13-20	140	11:30	101, 102,	7	568
3-9	217	29	390		569	10	569
8 ff.	417	20:1,3	389	12:1-11	222	<i>II Thessalonians</i>	
21	129	9-12	217, 559,	9	217, 269,	2:9	181, 183
33	121	35	102		278	<i>I Timothy</i>	
33-35	217	22:6-16	217	9 f.	229	1:10	304
34	218	24	102	28	181	3:3	615
36-42	217	26	533	13:1 ff.	607	5:21	101, 342
36-43	559	23:11	124	2	269	6:3	304
37	101, 584	17, 23 f.	533	15:6	569	16	182
40	574	24	535	9	537	<i>II Timothy</i>	
10:22	533	24:23	533	26	566	1:13	304
24	536	26:12-18	217	<i>II Corinthians</i>		3:8	139
28	500	27	666	1:11	278	4:3	304
38	243, 628,	27:14-44	217	5:2, 4	675	11	85
	704	43	533	6:7	217	17	217
45	129	43 f.	535	12:1 ff.	217	20	101
11:7	389	28	666	5	101	<i>Titus</i>	
12:1-19	217	28:1, 4	535	7	348	1:13	304
20 f.	542	1-6	217, 224	7-10	279	2:1, 2, 7 ff.	304
23	500	3-6	221	9	101	<i>Philemon</i>	
13:1	542, 563	8	553	9 f.	102	vs 24	85
6	140, 158	8-10	217	12	181, 183,	<i>Hebrews</i>	
9	326	9	101, 217		217	1:7	346
10	158	22	553	18	318	2:3 f.	250, 283,
11	217, 417	<i>Romans</i>				4	183, 217
12	129	1:5	653	<i>Galatians</i>		4:15	666
15	535	2:29	610	3:5	181, 217		
14:3	183, 217,	4:12	318	4:9	102		
	250, 283	20	500	13	101		
8	121, 436	6	462	14	309		
8-10	217	10:7	389				
9	266	11:29	157	<i>Ephesians</i>			
10	527	14:1 f.	102	1:19	182		
19-20	217	15:18 f.	245	2:2	353, 644		
15:12	183	19	183, 217,	3:16	181		
14	575						

<i>Hebrews</i>		<i>James</i>		<i>I John</i>		<i>Revelation</i>	
6:4 ff.	462	16	278	4:14	300	15	211
10:26	462					12	300
11:33	647	<i>I Peter</i>		<i>III John</i>		12:3	410
34	101	2:21	318	vs 10	433	10	211
36	102	3:16	522			13:13 f.	183
12:2	265	20	535	<i>Jude</i>		14:7	500
12	436	4:11	182	vs 6	342, 391	15:1, 3	183
13	436	5:7	278	vs 25	182	16:5	453
		11	182			9	500
<i>James</i>		<i>II Peter</i>		<i>Revelation</i>		13	372
2:19	372	2:4	342	1:6	182	14	183
5:3	489	20	459	3:16	309	18:2	372
14 101, 278, 311		3:9	231	4:9	500	19:7	500
14 f. 275, 279,				5:13	182	20	183
332		<i>I John</i>		7:16 f.	635	21:1	666
15 103, 293		2:20	283	11:13	500	22:5	413

TRANSCRIPTION OF HEBREW LETTERS ACCORDING TO EPSTEIN

א ׳	ב b	ו w	ז z	ח h
ט t	כ k	ס s	ע ׳	פ f
צ z	ק k	ש s	ש sh	ת th

INDEX OF AUTHORS' NAMES

- ALBERTZ 31, 239, 261, 283, 284, 620, 637, 652, 667, 686, 687
- ALLEN 147, 209, 334, 335, 384, 401, 406, 408, 411, 413, 487, 512, 531, 567, 622, 624, 639, 650, 661, 685, 688
- ALTHAUS 699
- AMMON, VON 22, 205, 329, 330, 380, 382, 392, 393, 420, 427, 455, 458, 459, 510-512, 515, 520, 521, 544, 565, 570, 583, 586, 605, 622, 627, 628, 631, 640
- ANDEL, VAN 82, 91, 99, 318, 405, 478
- APULEIUS 344, 561
- ARISTIDES 298
- ARISTOPHANES 308
- ARNOBIUS 167, 202, 223, 298, 305, 306, 427, 508, 669
- ASCHOFF 72, 73
- ATHANASIUS 201
- ATHENAEUS 602
- AUFHAUSER 151, 155, 588, 625, 662
- AUGUSTINUS 37, 38, 95, 344, 630
- AVI-YONAH 156
- BAAREN, VAN 4, 5, 7, 97, 348
- BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK EN LINDEBOOM 53, 54, 364
- BALLAUFF 64
- BARRETT 185, 219, 229, 427, 432, 434, 451, 455, 458, 532, 533, 542, 543, 545, 548, 549, 556, 557, 577, 579, 582, 587, 588, 591-595, 598, 599, 601, 606, 607, 610, 611, 615, 616, 622, 636, 659, 676, 677, 696
- BARTH, F. 87, 207, 208, 243, 309, 341, 390, 575, 590, 630, 631, 659, 662, 673, 684, 695
- BARTH, K. 34, 42, 43, 68, 85, 179, 181, 183, 192, 207, 216, 218, 229, 240, 244, 248, 252, 254, 258, 259, 269, 270, 278, 279, 284, 285, 287, 289, 302, 303, 336, 343, 380, 414, 426, 434, 480, 538, 540, 571, 575, 585, 590, 596, 634, 635, 648, 658, 665-668, 673, 678, 682, 687
- BARTSCH 701
- BASCHWITZ 87
- BAUER, L. 97, 314, 323, 355, 356, 568, 690
- BAUER, W. 101, 102, 103, 125, 132, 153, 190, 201, 306, 333, 382, 409, 412, 427, 438, 442, 524, 525, 552, 557, 563, 577, 587, 594, 599, 616, 651, 653, 659
- BAUERNFEIND 118, 315, 366, 379, 389, 391, 392
- BAUMANN 82, 111, 347, 348, 407
- BAVINCK 41, 42, 67, 68, 73, 210, 229, 281
- BAVINK 48, 59, 72
- BEEK 341, 350
- BEER-GALLING 279, 293, 295, 354, 511
- BEHM 527
- BENGEL 676
- BERENDTS UND GRAS 152
- BERG, VAN DEN 44
- BERGH VAN EYSINGA, VAN DEN 15, 26, 269, 412, 662-664
- BERKELBACH VAN DER SPRENKEL 222, 340, 383, 392, 419, 421, 443, 479, 483, 518, 526, 527, 555, 635, 647, 652, 668, 669, 696, 697
- BERKOUWER 39, 68, 77, 203, 240, 252, 278, 281, 283, 288-291, 705
- BERNARD 599, 600, 612, 659
- BERTHOLET 317
- BERTHOLET-GALLING 355
- BERTRAM 129, 148, 187, 219, 243, 390, 426, 433, 460
- BETH 49, 72
- BETZ, H. D. 8, 197, 390, 561, 683
- BETZ, O. 192, 252, 291, 656
- BEUS, DE 192, 212, 257
- BEYER 138, 145, 222, 445, 554, 575, 598, 623
- BIELER 119, 122, 202, 225, 244, 267, 513, 590, 655, 673
- BIETENHARDT 141, 322, 323
- BISHOP 384, 437, 574, 623, 638, 671, 677, 679, 686
- BLASS UND DEBRUNNER 125, 400, 524, 528, 536, 543, 553, 647, 653
- BLAU 6, 97, 139-142, 225, 309, 317, 321-323, 348, 351, 352, 356, 357, 388, 404

- BLEEKER 4, 97, 300
 BLESS 89, 374
 BLINZLER 150, 154, 557
 BLOCH 319, 404, 512
 BLUMHARDT 206, 207, 223, 230, 231, 616
 BODENHEIMER 225, 390, 671
 BOER, DE 142, 148, 315, 343
 BOEUFF, DU, EN KUIPER 110
 BÖHL 95, 354
 BOISMARD 591, 594, 611
 BONSIIVEN 157, 173
 BOUSSET 29
 BORNHÄUSER 145, 185, 188, 192, 197, 220, 237, 239, 244, 324, 387, 391, 393, 402, 412, 425, 444, 445, 485, 514, 515, 538, 572, 580, 587, 597, 654, 697
 BORNKAMM 180, 279, 534, 639, 649, 700
 BRANDT 428, 455, 532, 558, 596, 600, 611, 677
 BRAUN 219, 223, 350, 418, 645
 BRONGERS 101, 256, 260-263, 293
 BROOKS-CHARLES 265, 336
 BROUWER 251, 256, 409, 520
 BROYDÉ 171
 BRUCE 327, 379-382, 652
 BRUNNER 3, 41, 48, 50, 65, 239
 BÜCHSEL 271, 290, 434, 500, 585, 590, 591, 682
 BUCK, DE 307
 BULTMANN 31-33, 49, 50, 74-77, 121, 122, 124, 125, 127, 133, 135, 136, 184, 188, 198, 214, 219, 252, 258, 261, 269, 273, 325, 327, 335, 341, 378, 379, 382, 384, 385, 390, 392, 397, 398, 401, 406, 408, 411, 418-420, 422, 426, 430-434, 436, 440, 443, 446, 450, 451, 454-460, 480, 483, 495, 500-502, 504, 509, 516, 520, 522, 523, 530, 532, 533, 535, 542, 543, 545, 547-549, 551, 556, 557, 567, 571, 573, 576, 579-586, 589, 591-595, 597-599, 600, 606, 612, 614, 616, 619, 620, 625, 626, 636, 638, 641, 646, 650, 654, 670, 672, 673, 675, 676, 678, 687, 688, 700
 BURGERS 60
 BURKILL 704
 BUSSCHE, VAN DEN 532, 594, 595, 616
 CADMAN 589
 CAIRNS 13, 42, 58, 69, 107, 110, 112, 188, 189, 193, 229, 242, 249, 256, 267, 271
 CALVIN 40, 205, 206, 222, 223, 229, 241, 310, 312, 316, 317, 342, 347, 370, 388, 391, 403, 421, 428, 429, 449, 488, 516, 517, 520, 552, 569, 576, 622, 631, 673, 685, 691
 CANAAN 97, 98, 226, 308, 312, 314, 323, 343-346, 352, 355, 404, 448, 452, 552, 642
 CARADOG JONES 262, 275, 276, 421
 CAROL 465, 466
 CARREL 126, 275
 CASTIGLIONI 467
 CHAJES 181, 412, 423, 447, 511, 567, 571
 CLAUSING 3, 608
 CLAVIER 184, 611, 634, 636
 CLEMEN 26, 27, 137, 309, 318, 321, 326, 341, 346, 357, 389, 394, 407, 410, 442, 513, 580, 620, 642, 646, 662, 672
 CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS 83, 298, 344, 358, 359, 404, 629, 641, 642
 CONSTANDSE 9, 10
 CONZELMANN 180, 182
 COUPER 170
 CRESPIY 274, 279, 283, 705
 CULLMANN 31, 201, 235, 237, 387, 461, 462, 588, 597, 610, 611, 636, 664
 CURTIS AND MADSEN 295, 473
 CYPRIANUS 360
 CYRILLUS 298
 DAHL 250
 DALMAN 126-128, 161, 367, 378, 383, 386, 398, 410, 411, 419, 423, 424, 430, 436, 441, 451, 481, 495-499, 509, 523, 524, 533, 536, 541, 545, 551, 554, 567, 573, 578, 580, 583, 592, 621, 622, 624, 638, 650, 671, 675, 676, 679, 682, 689, 690, 695
 LE DANTEC 10
 DEHN 191, 382, 383, 392, 398, 420, 424, 445, 484, 487, 513, 555, 572, 620, 648, 649, 652, 696
 DEISSMANN 357, 374, 522
 DELLING 141, 426, 482, 504, 505, 516, 615
 DENNERT 71
 DERRETT 680
 DIBELIUS 31, 104, 107, 131, 134, 135,

- 269, 326, 370, 379, 382, 384, 392,
 393, 396-399, 419, 422, 426, 436, 440,
 450, 480, 494, 502-504, 509, 523, 530,
 545, 560, 567, 571-573, 578, 590, 591,
 598, 606, 619, 638, 647, 650, 652,
 654, 663, 672, 678, 687
 DIEM 701
 DIEMER 13, 40, 288, 289
 DIETZ 660
 DIODORUS SICULUS 603
 DODD 396, 431-433, 450, 462, 463,
 548, 578, 588, 609, 611, 635, 667,
 687, 704
 DOEVE 446
 DOKTER 48, 51, 71, 73
 DOLCH 41, 64, 67
 DRACHMANN 7
 DREWS 26, 122
 DRIESCH 203, 660
 DROOGLEEVER FORTUYN 100, 309
 DUHM 225, 341, 344, 345, 349, 362
 DUMAS 25, 367
 DIJKSTERHUIS 51-56, 58, 59, 73, 98,
 99
 EASTON 245
 EBSTEIN 100, 104-106, 108, 109, 309,
 314, 330, 344, 349, 376, 380, 382,
 401, 402, 415, 417, 438, 448, 467,
 484, 491, 501, 506, 507, 509, 515,
 520, 521, 544, 554, 565
 BAKER EDDY 84, 85, 306
 EDELSTEIN, E. J. AND EDELSTEIN, L.
 103, 121, 126, 194, 197, 226, 299,
 415, 427, 435, 561, 562, 641, 655
 EDERSHEIM 147, 442, 574, 598
 EERDMANS 149, 355, 356
 EISLER 151, 152, 155, 173, 174, 369,
 629, 630
 EITREM 89, 102, 218, 225, 307, 308,
 311, 313, 315, 320, 322, 323, 326,
 327, 333, 335, 357, 368, 380, 381,
 385, 386, 388, 410, 418, 419, 421,
 422, 481, 510, 522, 533, 551, 552,
 647
 ELAUT 80, 91, 311, 453
 ELDERENBOSCH 313
 ELIADE 358, 522
 ELWORTHY 349, 356
 ELZINGA 110, 259, 263, 278, 314
 EPIPHANIUS 201, 298, 333, 334, 588
 ESKING 701
 ESSER 308, 417
 EURIPIDES 225, 602
 EUSEBIUS 85, 86, 152, 153, 199, 200,
 202, 218, 224, 227, 228, 240, 297,
 298, 305, 324, 333, 358, 451, 518,
 563, 604
 FABER 110, 111, 279, 280
 FASCHER 199, 238, 298, 433
 FENNER 85, 89, 101, 104, 107, 109,
 133, 184, 191, 250, 266, 269, 301,
 309, 310, 316, 317, 320, 334, 376,
 377, 381, 390, 393, 394, 402, 405,
 417, 420, 425, 439, 448, 455, 490,
 491, 501, 507, 521, 524, 533, 544,
 554, 565, 578
 FIEBIG 125-127, 133, 134, 142-144,
 146, 162, 196, 225, 236, 272, 324,
 331, 376, 396, 560, 562, 585, 624,
 643, 657, 672, 682
 FIEDLER 641, 642, 644
 FILLION 29, 179, 189, 193, 242, 244,
 268, 620, 630, 685, 695
 FLAVIUS JOSEPHUS 52, 83, 120, 122,
 127, 141, 151, 196, 202, 295, 311,
 335, 348, 354, 362, 404, 419, 423,
 441, 451-453, 506, 573, 671, 680
 FLEG 157
 FOERSTER 181, 340, 341, 345, 352,
 408, 518, 520
 FRANKL 259
 FRANCES 519
 FRAZER 307, 319, 323, 389, 602, 642
 FREUD 142, 340, 341
 FRICK 3
 FRIDRICHSEN 147, 179, 188, 243, 246,
 267, 334
 FRIEDRICH 221, 238, 247, 250, 282
 FROST 228, 258, 276
 FRÖVIG 195, 220, 236, 238, 239, 242,
 244, 268, 380
 FUCHS 668
 GALLING 311, 344, 355, 389, 441,
 482, 556, 583, 584, 598, 671, 680,
 682, 690
 Gebedsgenezing, Vragen rondom de —
 (= Problems of prayer healing. A
 report compiled by the Reformed
 Council for Church and Sick Welfare
 and adopted by the General Synod of
 the Netherlands Reformed Church)
 259, 267, 278
 GEBSER 57, 59, 332

- GILS 192, 237, 240, 309, 636, 670
 GISPEN 467
 GÖDAN 92, 111, 259, 304, 566, 581, 582, 589
 GODET 384, 422, 442, 538, 544, 557, 574, 674
 GOEZ 65
 GOGARTEN 248, 283
 GOGUEL 44
 GOLDSTEIN 156, 158-168, 170
 GOODSPEED 390, 628, 700
 GOPPELT 165, 166, 185, 191, 195, 215, 236, 370, 412, 484, 490, 567, 575, 636, 646, 696
 GOULD 191, 327, 379, 381, 387, 398, 401, 402, 419, 420, 424, 439, 443, 445, 448, 516, 569, 620, 630
 GRANT 8, 47, 52, 53, 56, 86, 200, 603, 611, 646, 655, 697, 703
 GREEVEN 271
 GREBER 595, 605
 GRESSMANN 235
 GREYDANUS 386, 391, 393, 400, 409, 410, 422, 423, 425, 438, 485, 497, 500, 514, 517, 518, 520, 544, 552, 553, 558, 569, 572, 573, 575, 630, 647, 671, 673
 GROLLENBERG EN DEURSEN, VAN 419, 430
 GRONDIJS 315, 320, 321
 GROOT, DE 408
 GROOT, DE en HULST 257, 290, 322, 645, 648, 667
 GROSHEIDE 585, 587, 600, 615, 634, 659
 GROTIUS 676
 GRUNDMANN 103, 124, 128, 129, 137, 181-183, 186, 192, 219-221, 234, 235, 252, 267, 268, 270, 301, 303, 316, 324, 366, 400, 444, 458, 459, 513, 579, 645, 646
 GUARDINI 67, 78, 513
 GUIGNEBERT 208, 341, 342, 345, 362
 HÄBERLIN 3
 HAGGARD 85, 88, 91, 99, 100, 104, 440
 HAITJEMA 381
 HALLIDAY 26
 HAMER 105, 210, 405
 HANAUER 564
 HANSE 372, 671
 HARDER 372
 HARNACK, VON 28, 82, 83, 85, 86, 200, 299, 303, 356, 374, 375, 382, 497, 506, 518, 519, 639, 651
 HARTDORFF 15, 151, 156
 HARTINGSVELD, VAN 185, 581
 HARTMANN 57, 60, 61, 64
 HAUCK 192, 209, 269, 295, 312, 314, 327, 379, 385, 398, 400, 402, 412, 419, 422, 425, 438, 443, 445, 484-486, 496, 497, 500, 513-515, 526, 528, 531, 552-554, 567, 572-574, 598, 620, 628, 629, 634, 646, 671, 677
 HEADLAM 13, 180
 HEERING 251
 HEHN 480
 HEIBERG 81, 82, 300
 HEILER 96, 97, 255, 274, 307, 351
 HEIM 60, 67, 107, 110, 274, 275, 405
 HEISENBERG 49, 56, 58, 61, 62
 HELD, G. J. 141
 HELD, H. J. 135, 269, 270, 284, 385, 397, 400-402, 411, 418, 448, 523, 551, 630, 649, 668
 HEMPEL 147, 220, 238, 240, 291, 294, 295, 303, 304, 358
 HENNECKE 119, 122, 129, 153, 199, 202, 218, 224, 225, 297, 312, 346, 417, 506, 562, 563, 572, 588, 663, 669
 HEPPE 41
 HERBERG 157
 HERDER 15, 185, 577, 615
 TRAVERS HERFORD 156, 161, 164
 HERODOTUS 294, 407, 477, 626, 641, 683
 HERRLICH 300
 HERRMANN 41
 HERZOG 81, 82, 104, 105, 118, 122, 126, 196, 226, 269, 299, 330, 404, 407, 415, 416, 420, 427, 435, 442, 447, 561, 563, 564, 570, 633
 HESZ 15, 286
 HEYDE 64
 HIDDING 7, 97
 HIPPOLYTUS 297, 298
 HIRSCH 279
 HOFFMANN, H. 205
 HOFFMANN, J. G. H. 23, 29
 HOLMSTRØM 251
 HÖLSCHER 345, 346, 349, 480
 HOONACKER, VAN 345
 HOYKAAS, R. 3, 68, 98, 250
 HORACE 602
 HORST 528

- HOVE, VAN 38
 HOWARD COBB 232, 277
 HULST 472
 HULST, VAN DE, en PEURSEN, VAN 78
 HUNTER 34, 242, 248, 261, 390, 569,
 635, 640, 659
 HUNZINGER 696
 HUSBAND 149

 IERSEL, VAN 199
 IRENAEUS 87, 157, 200, 201, 215, 227,
 236, 245, 248, 253, 258, 297, 321,
 324, 333, 426, 510, 563, 588, 611
 ISAAC 157
 IUSTINUS 87, 153, 157, 165, 226, 227,
 236, 248, 297, 298, 324, 359, 381, 603

 JAKOBOVITS 84, 259, 294
 JAMES 55, 341
 JANET 105, 314
 JASPERS 339
 JEANMAIRE 373, 601, 607
 JELKE 27, 45, 65, 133, 184, 187, 228,
 244, 247, 265, 267, 272
 JEREMIAS, A. 226, 307, 309, 323, 334,
 346, 413, 428, 538
 JEREMIAS, JOACH. 190, 193, 378, 389,
 499, 593, 611
 JIRKU 225, 323, 339, 344-346, 349,
 350, 354, 355, 452
 JOCZ 164, 167, 171
 JOHANNES DAMASCENUS 248, 298,
 364, 588
 JOHANSSON 149
 JONES 29
 JONES, G. O.; ROTBLATT; WHITROW
 49
 JONG, H. W. M. DE 86, 141, 240, 255,
 256, 264, 266, 340
 JONG, J. M. DE 33, 701
 JONG, K. H. E. DE 139, 376, 660
 JONGE, M. DE 701
 JORDAN 57
 JUNCKER 258

 KAFKA 3, 46, 52, 66, 378, 485, 518
 KÄHLER 700
 KAISER 666
 KANT 16
 KAUPEL 340, 341, 344, 345, 349, 350,
 354, 355
 KAUTZSCH 83, 325, 416
 KEULERS 147, 192, 219, 244, 246, 258,
 259, 327, 333-335, 364, 384, 392, 402,
 412, 413, 418-420, 422, 423, 428, 430,
 434, 441, 443, 450, 452, 455-459, 479,
 480, 483, 487, 495, 501, 504, 505,
 512, 514, 516, 518, 520, 523, 525-527,
 532-539, 541-543, 545, 549, 553, 556,
 569, 572, 575-577, 579, 581-586, 591,
 592, 594-597, 599, 600, 610, 620, 624,
 630, 639, 647, 651-653, 659, 661, 670,
 671, 673, 675, 676, 678, 685, 691, 695
 KIEFER 118, 119
 KITTEL, G. 284, 325, 522, 616, 621,
 636
 KITTEL, R. 349
 KLAAS 3, 211
 KLAUSNER 145, 151, 159, 160, 167,
 170-174, 187, 190, 213, 215, 236,
 245, 246, 334, 362, 369, 376, 383,
 393, 398, 407, 411, 413, 425, 515,
 565, 632, 640, 660, 691, 696
 KLEINKNECHT 691
 KLOEK 92, 105, 210
 KLOSTERMANN 125, 140, 147, 148,
 190, 202, 209, 218, 222, 258, 326, 327,
 334, 335, 383, 385, 386, 396-398, 400,
 403, 406, 408, 409, 412, 417-420, 422,
 423, 440, 441, 443, 479, 480-484, 487,
 495, 497, 499, 500, 504, 505, 509, 515,
 521, 523, 527, 531, 533-535, 538, 539,
 541, 551, 552, 556, 567, 573, 575,
 622, 629, 647, 648, 652, 661, 664,
 670-674, 681, 684, 685, 688, 695
 KLUIN 96, 308, 331
 KLIJN 179, 180, 369, 493
 KOCH, H. G. 10
 KOCH, K. E. 204, 210, 374
 KOCKELMANS 60, 61
 KOEHLER 31, 396, 550
 KOETS 359
 KÖHLER 341, 361
 KOHNSTAMM 62, 63, 229, 230, 242,
 243, 267
 KOOLE 185, 186, 266, 293, 434, 589
 KOPP 383, 390, 398, 410, 411, 413,
 419, 422, 423, 430, 440, 451, 496,
 519, 536, 573, 580, 583, 592, 620,
 621, 624, 638, 651, 679, 689
 KORFF 65, 203, 240, 265, 291, 449
 KÖSTER 553
 KOTY 95, 96, 226, 307, 375, 385, 402,
 477, 565, 570
 KOUWENAAR 466
 KRAMER 7

- KRAUSS 209, 334, 569, 632
 KRONER 239, 703, 705
 KRUYT 96, 307, 308, 318, 320, 402, 580
 KUHAUPT 30, 639
 KÜMMEL 215, 433
 KÜSTER 225

 LACTANTIUS, 360, 361, 364, 630
 LAMBERECHTS 59, 61, 77
 LANGTON 206, 208, 210, 341, 345, 349, 350, 361, 365, 388, 410
 LAUTERBACH 156, 158, 160-162
 LEEUW, DE 81, 82, 111, 120, 121, 299
 LEEUW, VAN DER 4, 6, 306, 339
 LEEUWEN, J. A. C. VAN 192, 327, 380, 386, 387, 393, 398, 402, 412, 413, 419-421, 424, 439, 440, 444, 481, 488, 518, 526, 555, 569, 620, 630, 652, 695
 LEEUWEN, W. S. VAN 261
 LEISEGANG 298
 LÉPICIER 35, 191, 194, 219, 229, 241, 246, 416, 512, 513, 631.
 LERLE 50, 546, 547
 LEVERTOFF AND GOUDGE 533, 534, 686
 LEWIS 68, 179, 231
 LIEK 85, 105, 276, 492
 LIGHTFOOT 381, 555
 LINDEBOOM 80, 84, 88, 99, 467, 479
 LINDESKOG 31, 152, 157, 158, 165, 168, 170, 171, 174
 LINDYER 259
 LOEWE 362
 LOHMEYER 410
 LOHSE 212, 424
 LOOS, VAN DER 31, 151, 152, 193, 195, 235, 306, 369, 424
 LOOSTEN, DE 24, 691, 692
 LÜBKERS 533, 598, 599
 LUCIANUS 8, 121, 122, 124, 125, 404, 560, 561, 655
 LUDWIG 48
 LUNDSTRÖM 251
 LUTHARDT 41, 251
 LUTZ 466

 MACKINNON 72, 179, 184, 208, 239, 243, 244, 265, 267, 317, 332-334, 341, 390, 420, 510, 515, 521, 565, 633, 659, 660
 MAES 351, 400
 MAHR 274
 MÁNEK 666, 674, 677

 MANSON, T. W. 187, 251, 252, 526
 MANSON, W. 247, 531
 MARXSEN 180, 268, 701
 MASPERO 202, 318, 394
 MATTER 251, 252
 MAUTHNER 10, 13, 14, 229
 MC GINLEY 31, 134-137
 MEAD 403, 453, 521
 MELSEN, VAN 53, 59, 61, 62, 73
 MENOUD 247, 283, 285, 616, 635, 666, 687, 705
 MENSCHING 4-7, 10, 40, 44, 45, 69, 447, 684
 MEYER 202, 237-239, 327, 472, 598
 MICHAELIS 31, 182, 286, 434, 491, 511, 553, 556
 MICHEL 39
 MICHEL 413, 414, 433, 583
 MICKLEM 30, 104, 112, 113, 184, 208, 268, 272, 310, 311, 336, 362, 365, 373, 377, 380, 390, 403, 405, 406, 417, 425, 439, 481, 491, 492, 502, 507, 509, 510, 515, 521, 525, 553, 557, 558
 MIERLO, VAN 56, 61, 67, 71
 MINUCIUS FELIX 358, 359, 361
 MISKOTTE 157, 159, 480
 MONDEN 39, 205, 211, 229, 247, 268
 MONTEFIORE 174
 MOREAU 151, 152, 154, 155, 167
 MOURIK BROEKMAN, VAN 29, 30, 189, 265, 276, 331, 332, 522, 565, 566, 584, 660, 661
 MULLER 443

 NEANDER 21, 22, 362, 384, 386, 390, 402, 585, 608, 693
 NESTLE 56, 81
 NEUBERG 45, 46, 61, 63, 64, 67, 68, 70-72, 77
 NIFTRIK, VAN 274
 NILSSON 323, 356
 NOACK 211, 263, 341, 348, 350, 351, 648
 NOLLE 92, 277, 279
 NOORDENBOS 57
 NOORDMANS 240, 254

 OBBINK, H. TH. 686
 OBBINK, H. W. 321, 323, 386
 OEPKE 27, 65, 80-82, 101, 133, 134, 138, 197, 222, 250, 255, 257, 260, 262, 270, 294, 295, 300-303, 310, 497, 557, 566, 569, 594, 597, 622, 675

- OESTERREICH 87-89, 210, 331, 341,
 347, 348, 353, 357, 362, 365, 372-375,
 382, 389, 411
 ORIGENES 87, 95, 98, 165-167, 199,
 219, 226, 236, 241, 245, 254, 266, 297,
 298, 320, 323, 324, 342, 358, 383, 510,
 571, 609, 625, 636, 672
 OTTO 26, 361, 362, 629, 660
 OURSLER 277
 OVINK 60

 PALACHE 158
 PAULUS 16, 17, 127, 329, 330, 340,
 386, 392, 402, 414, 427, 440, 448,
 454-459, 484, 490, 497, 498, 501, 512,
 521, 544, 552, 553, 565, 568, 574, 586,
 587, 591, 605, 620, 627, 640, 659, 662,
 684, 685
 PAUSANIAS 602
 PAUWELS 39, 40, 67, 228
 PEDERSEN 261, 317, 321-323, 325,
 348, 389
 PERELS 27, 33, 129, 131, 132, 135-137,
 145, 146, 184-188, 214, 238, 245, 249,
 262, 284, 285, 315, 381, 384, 396, 397,
 401, 418, 424, 440, 480, 567, 573, 632,
 638, 646, 650
 PETERSEN 189
 PETERSON 126, 130, 404, 517
 PETTAZZONI 97, 198
 PHILOSTRATOS (VITA APOLL.) 120-
 122, 124, 127, 130, 224, 335, 395, 416,
 436, 452, 506, 560, 644
 PICK 296
 PICKL 235
 PINKHOF 438, 506, 507
 PLANCK 71
 PLINY 308, 311, 405, 478, 561, 603, 683
 PLUMMER 203, 333, 390-392, 410, 411,
 423, 424, 438, 448, 483-485, 492, 493,
 495-497, 499, 500, 514, 516, 518, 532,
 533, 535, 536, 538, 539, 553, 556, 557,
 569, 571, 574, 630, 634, 673
 PREISKER 6, 95, 225, 323, 388, 527,
 562, 601, 607
 PREUSS 84, 214, 226, 294, 295, 309,
 322, 348, 349, 352, 362, 401, 406, 407,
 415, 430, 435, 438-440, 453, 467-471,
 473-477, 479, 498, 505, 507, 509, 510,
 515, 553, 565, 580
 PROKSCH 290, 322, 363
 RAMSAY 11, 703

 RÉGLA, DE 24, 266, 330, 410, 565,
 586, 605
 REITZENSTEIN 6, 25, 118, 119, 125,
 139, 140, 262, 311, 318, 322, 346,
 395, 404, 408, 655
 RENAN 23, 24, 377
 RENGSTORF 184, 188, 220-222, 243,
 258, 299, 332, 410, 411, 425, 427, 433,
 434, 449, 475, 537, 541, 570, 575,
 583, 616, 620, 632, 671
 RÉVÉSZ 420
 REYMOND 647, 665
 RICCIOTTI 15
 RICHARDSON 33-35, 179, 186, 242,
 244, 246, 247, 253, 267, 445, 620,
 624, 697
 RIDDERBOS 191, 251, 254, 257-259,
 261, 263, 267, 281, 282, 370, 387,
 392, 445
 RIESENFELD 209, 235
 RISTOW und MATTHIAE 701
 RIVERS 93, 94, 99, 256, 294, 335, 357,
 402, 403
 ROBERTSON 353, 564, 606, 655
 ROBINSON, J. M. 700
 ROBINSON, TH. H. und HORST, F. 345
 ROHDE 341, 349, 358, 388
 ROPES 103, 278, 279, 311
 RUDOLPH 294, 473
 RÜHLE 641
 RULER, VAN 212, 215, 216, 702, 705
 RÜMKE 111
 RUPPRECHT 41, 45, 107, 205, 236, 245,
 272, 685, 696, 697
 RUTGERS 465

 SAINTYVES 3, 4, 10, 11, 184, 603, 604,
 606, 620, 626, 627, 655-657, 683
 SALVADOR 171, 172, 242, 453
 SCHÄFER 24, 25, 191, 317, 381, 565,
 605, 629
 SCHICK 31
 SCHLATTER 144, 145, 150, 236, 272,
 643
 SCHLEIERMACHER 17, 18, 192, 243,
 244, 271, 554, 565, 584, 585, 590,
 636, 647, 682, 691
 SCHLIER 249, 311, 312, 348, 376, 379,
 387, 388, 682
 SCHLINGENSIEPEN 6, 27, 200, 201,
 205, 239, 241, 243, 248, 588, 632
 SCHMIDT, H. 349
 SCHMIDT, K. L. 31, 145, 251, 384,

- 394, 397, 411, 412, 418, 481, 509, 542,
551, 567, 573, 591, 593, 595, 596, 600,
606, 607, 609, 610, 612, 613, 620,
621, 650, 684
- SCHMIDT, W. 96, 97, 307
- SCHMIEDEL 29, 133, 191, 204, 394, 696
- SCHNACKENBURG 252, 667, 701
- SCHNEIDER 6, 102, 119, 126, 132, 141,
165, 260, 301, 323, 324, 375, 380, 386,
387, 424, 432, 450, 511, 514, 526, 592,
596, 607, 617, 671
- SCHNIEWIND 243, 332, 379, 382, 385,
387, 396, 402, 420, 439, 493, 571,
620, 697
- SCHOEPS 157, 158
- SCHRAGE 433, 567
- SCHREUDER 231
- SCHRENK 485, 487, 489
- SCHUBART 315
- SCHUBERT 204
- SCHULTE 402
- SCHÜRER 83, 139, 141, 164, 212,
318, 323, 351, 356, 404, 419, 423,
432, 482, 511, 523, 533, 535, 567,
598, 680, 681
- SCHWEITZER 15, 16, 19, 21, 25, 193,
236, 391, 402, 410, 577, 605, 628,
633, 634, 660, 684, 697
- SCHWEIZER 252
- SEESEMANN 214, 262, 602, 606, 611,
615
- SELMS, VAN 255
- SENG 104, 106, 109, 263, 330, 401,
406, 409, 420, 428, 439, 448, 454,
455, 466, 492, 509, 510, 515, 565
- SEVENSTER, G. 27, 31, 113, 138, 185,
186, 189, 203, 221, 239, 247, 251,
265-267, 271, 273, 281, 290, 291,
501, 526, 528, 539, 540, 566, 616,
617, 700, 701
- SEVENSTER, J. N. 137
- SIERKSMA 340
- SIGERIST 80, 92, 99, 255, 341, 351
- SIKKEN 44
- SILVER 199
- SIMONS 97, 465, 466, 477, 479
- SJÖBERG 642
- SMELIK 533, 549, 585, 615, 702
- SMIT 29, 205, 206, 210, 340, 383, 384,
392, 394, 401, 402, 411-413, 520
- SMITH 27, 362, 394, 410, 436, 576,
610, 677
- SNAITH 296
- SODEN, VON 132, 133, 204, 290, 291
- SÖDER 118, 202, 224
- SOLTAU 29, 696
- SPINOZA 11, 12
- STAFFORD-CLARK 88
- STÄHLIN 101, 368, 461, 481, 520, 568,
570, 580, 682, 692
- STÄHLIN/GRUNDMANN 257
- STANGE 57
- STAUFFER 74, 75, 137, 147, 149, 185,
195, 211, 235, 271, 290, 368, 369,
381, 450, 500, 501, 552, 566, 593,
596, 616, 636, 647, 650, 667
- STELMA 151
- STEMPLINGER 95, 299, 318, 322, 346,
353, 355, 356, 404, 644
- STRACK 158, 160, 162, 164-168, 354,
405, 478, 506
- STRACK-BILLERBECK 139, 148, 149,
183, 196, 199, 209, 212-214, 224, 236,
237, 251, 257, 258, 261, 296, 309, 310,
312, 314, 315, 326, 331, 341, 343, 346,
348, 351, 352, 379, 383, 385, 387, 388,
401, 403, 404, 406-409, 413, 415, 423,
424, 430, 432, 441, 445, 451-453, 457,
460, 468, 469, 471-474, 479, 482, 488,
497, 499, 500, 504-506, 510, 511, 514,
520, 522, 527, 535, 536, 541, 545, 552,
553, 556, 559, 560, 567, 568, 571, 573,
577, 578, 580, 583, 584, 586, 592-595,
598, 599, 622, 623, 625, 643, 651,
675, 680, 681, 683, 689, 690
- STRATHMANN 482, 488, 489
- STRAUSS 19-21, 206, 329, 330, 382,
396, 417, 427, 449, 484, 490, 501, 512,
514, 548, 549, 564, 575, 577, 590, 601,
608, 620, 628, 631, 632, 640, 644, 658,
662, 665, 683-685, 696
- SUETONIUS 308, 416, 427, 436
- SULLIVAN 54, 56, 61
- SUNIER 349
- TACITUS 123, 126, 308, 416, 427, 436
- TAYLOR 30, 185, 203, 208, 390, 394,
412, 413, 491, 569, 574, 577, 623,
636, 640, 647, 659, 701
- TENHAEFF 112, 203, 276, 512
- TENNANT 4, 13, 43, 51, 66, 69, 107,
111, 241, 248, 249
- TERTULLIANUS 95, 153, 166, 167, 200,
201, 227, 236, 297, 312, 321, 342, 349,
452, 497, 510, 603, 647, 665
- THOMAS AQUINAS 35-37, 98, 196, 241,

- 264, 316, 342, 344, 347, 364, 370,
 427, 631
 THURNEYSSEN 207, 230, 248, 259, 261,
 302, 303
 TITIUS 5, 54-56, 70, 73, 83, 84, 141,
 142, 184, 189, 265
 TÖDT 215, 268, 446
 TOLSMA 661
 TOURNIER 100
 TRACHTENBERG 98, 141, 323, 348,
 356, 358, 361, 403
 TRAUB 27, 104, 106, 146, 184, 189,
 362, 377, 381, 390, 417, 521, 554,
 565, 590, 658
 TRENCH 391, 392, 488, 525, 526, 528,
 532, 537, 542, 544, 569, 588, 608,
 631, 634, 678
 TROELS LUND 80, 122, 130, 633
 TUINSTRA 253, 254, 370
 TURNER 489, 525

 UBBINK 258, 459, 532, 547, 548, 579,
 581, 582, 585, 590-592, 596, 615,
 654, 677
 UNNIK, VAN 137, 535

 VEDDER 105, 111, 405
 VELDHUIZEN, VAN 448, 482, 557
 VIOLET 693
 VISSER 40, 660
 VISSER, DE 675
 VOLZ 235, 237
 VOS, DE 74
 VRIEZEN 50, 296, 325, 341, 368, 645

 WAGENVOORT 5
 WALZER 82

 WARNECK 96, 306-308, 318, 365
 WASZINK 349, 452
 WEATHERHEAD 208, 267, 275, 276,
 279, 318, 365, 444, 455, 456, 458,
 480, 491, 492, 515, 521, 525-527, 533,
 544, 546, 554, 558, 569
 WEHRUNG 205
 WEINREICH 4, 6, 25, 26, 82, 124-126,
 197, 226, 308, 313, 314, 319, 359,
 389, 417, 562, 642
 WEISS 552
 WEIZSÄCKER, VON 51, 57-60, 71
 WENDLAND 37, 40
 WENZL 60, 72, 547
 WHITE 56, 83, 84, 88, 319, 353, 355,
 564, 644
 WHITEHEAD 50
 WILKENS 185, 430, 595, 600
 WINDISCH 29, 269
 WINTER 150, 159, 383
 WOLFF 235
 WOOLSTON 13, 14, 236, 242, 382, 383,
 442, 451, 454, 455, 510, 522, 565,
 574, 577, 583-586, 609, 631, 691
 WORCESTER, MC COMB, CORIAT 107,
 110, 243, 244, 267, 303, 334, 362,
 375, 393, 402, 409, 444, 515
 WOUDE, VAN DER 140, 238
 WREDE 364-366
 WÜNSCH 323

 ZAHN 496
 ZAMBACO PACHA 390, 465, 466
 ZORAB 88, 112, 203, 221, 566
 ZSCHARNACK 13
 ZWAAN, DE 31, 580, 614

ERRATA

p. 126, footnote 2, line 3; p. 130, lines 17 and 20; footnotes 6, 7 and 8, *in stead of*: PETERSEN, *read*: PETERSON.

p. 202, line 1, *in stead of*: Arnobuis *read*: Arnobius